

A
VINDICATION
OF
Anti-Cotton,
AGAINST THE
CAVILS
OF HIS
ANSWERS.

WHEN this little Treatise first appeared in the World, it was received with almost universal Applause. The barbarous Assassination of *Henry* the Great, and the general Detestation of that Society, whose Doctrine did Legitimate so great a Villany, had sufficiently disposed Mens minds for the Reception of it; and then the Freedom and Plainness of the Author, the Sharpness and Vehemency of his Expression, and the Publication of so many choice and surprizing Passages, easily gain'd it the Vogue and Esteem of all, who were not engag'd to the Interests, or prepossessed with the Principles of the Holy Order. At this the Society were alarm'd, they saw their pernicious Doctrines unfolded, their Intrigues unravel'd, and those Practises which they would have concealed in Darkness and
L the

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

the Shadow of Death, expos'd to the open View of all Men. Something therefore was to be done to regain their Credit; a Book that could not be fairly answered, might yet be possibly run down with Noise and Confidence; and the want of strength in the Aggressors, be supplied in the number of them. *Gresler* in *Germany*, a Father of the Society in *France*; *Eudamon Johannes* at *Rome*, are all employed to confute our Author. The first of these I have not met with; the second Entitles his Book, *An Apologetical Answer to the Calumnies of Anti-Cotton*: In his Preface he Charges him with three hundred Lies, and two hundred Calumnies, Absurdities and Mistakes innumerable; and in the beginning of his Apology, quarrels him for entitling himself *Anti-Cotton*, and not *Anti-Jesuit*; and calling it a Book, and not an infamous Libel. Such severe Remarks as these, are every where to be met with in this Apologist; yet the Jesuits thought this Apology worth sending to King *James* to vindicate their Order. And the Learned *Isaac Casaubon* employ'd his Pen to confute it in an Amicable Epistle to *Fronto Ducaus*, a French Jesuit, who had been his intimate Friend. In this Epistle he fairly justifies the Charge of maintaining the lawfulness of King-killing against the Jesuits, and Answers the Cavils of the Apologist against the Citations of *Anti-Cotton*; and this he did so successfully, that the Jesuits (who always Calumniate, when they cannot Answer) endeavoured to run him down with Lies and Slanders upon himself, his Father, and whole Family; and declared him to be no Scholar, one that could not write *Latin*, and scarce understood it; yet his Answer to that Apologist contains both good *Latin*, and good Sense; sufficiently clears the main Point in dispute, and supercedes the use of any further Reply. And therefore (tho I shall not wholly neglect him, yet) I shall here more particularly apply my self to consider the Answer of *Eudamon Johannes*, (which the Author of *Anti-Cotton*, with others, suspected to be a disguised Name, but afterwards it appeared to be his true one) a *Cretian* by Birth, but educated from his Youth among the Jesuits at *Rome*, where he was in some esteem with Cardinal *Bellarmin*, and *Urban* the 8th, and was therefore both by Education and Interest, engaged to assert the Deposing Doctrine, and all the other rebellious Maxims of that encroaching

See,

See, for which he is often Stigmatiz'd by our Author, and which he is so far from disowning in his Answer to him, that he more than once affirms it to be an Article of Faith, establish'd by the concurring Suffrages of Doctors, of Popes, and Councils, and universal Tradition. What this Author offers to refute the Charge of *Anti-Cotton*, I shall reduce to these three heads.

1. What he objects to the Charge of teaching the lawfulness of Deposing and Killing Kings. 2. What to that of some other of their Doctrines here imputed to them. And lastly, What he advances against the Matters of Fact contained in him.

I. For the setting this whole Matter in its true Light, it is requisite to lay down a Summary of the Jesuit Doctrine in this Point, that so it may be distinctly known what that is, whereof they are accused, and whether the Defence they make, be sufficient to discharge them.

1. Then, they carefully distinguish betwixt a Tyrant by Usurpation, and a Tyrant by Administration; one that has no Right and Title to the Crown, and one that is a Legitimate Prince, but governs Tyrannically; as to the former of these, 'tis their general Opinion, that such an Usurper may be lawfully killed by any private Person, and that here Killing is no Murder. But this is not allowed by *Azorius*, and he grounds his Dissent upon the Decree of the Council of *Constance*, which seems to condemn the other Opinion as impious and heretical; upon the Rules of Equity and Justice, which will not allow the condemning and executing, even the worst of Men, unheard; and upon the Laws of God and Nature, which are against private Mens usurping a Power of Life and Death, and executing that Vengeance which belongs only to God, and those whom he hath appointed to be the Ministers of it.

Mor. Inst. pars
2. l. 11. c. 5.
q. 10.

2. As to the other Species of Tyranny by Administration, they affirm, That a lawful Prince becomes a Tyrant, not only when he Governs contrary to Law and Justice, Oppresses and Destroys his Subjects, and subverts the Constitution of Civil Government: But also, when he invades the Rights and Immunities of the Clergy, or enacts Laws against the Church, or becomes a Persecutor of Catholicks, and an Abettor of Heresy,

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

Page 6, 7, 8,
9, 10.

* Step. Hoieda Visirator Societatis Jesu in Provincia Toletana potestate speciali facta a N. patre Generali Claudio Aquaviva. Do facultatem ut imprimantur libri tres de Regē & Regis institutione, quos scripsit & composuit P. Joh. Mariana ejusdem Societatis, quippe approbatis prius a viris gravibus & doctis ex eodem nostro ordine, in cujus rei fidem has literas dedi meo nomine subscripras, & mei officii sigillo munitas. *Madridi 4. Non. Dec. 1599. Vid. Epist. Casaub.* p. 42.

† Thuani continuatio lib. 3.
p. 100.

or does lastly refuse to own the Authority of Christ's Vicegerent, and withdraws his Obedience from the Successor of St. Peter. And concerning such a Tyrant, there are some of the Jesuits that have asserted it lawful for any private Person to destroy him; others require the publick Sentence of the States of any Kingdom to Authorise the Murder; but they unanimously agree in the ascribing to the Pope a Power of deposing him. The first of these is the known Opinion of *John Mariana*; the Author of *Anti-Cotton* has given us a large Account of this Man's horrid Divinity; and 'tis worth observing what variety of Shifts the Jesuits have used to discharge themselves of him. They lik'd the Man and his Doctrine well enough, but it was a little Scandalous, and all the World was alarm'd at it. At first, therefore, his Book pass'd Muster among

them, and 'twas recommended to the World with as full an *Approbation as the Society ever gave to any of their Authors: and afterwards (as is shew'd in *Anti-Cotton*, and the Preface) it was applauded by several great Men of the Society, as conformable to the Sentiments of their Order, and containing nothing contradictory to the Catholick Faith. But when at length this Book became the Subject of Debate, was

made use of by their Enemies as a constant Topick of Reproach against them, was first universally decry'd, and then solemnly condemned by the *Sorbon*, and the Parliament of *Paris*; then it was thought requisite to dissemble their kindness to this Author, and for a while to seem to disapprove him. Father *Cotton* first in his declatory Letter publish'd 1610, styles him a rash and trifling Author, and then † produces a Condemnation of him from the same General, *Aquaviva*, by whose Authority he was before Licens'd, and in which yet the Name of *Mariana* is not so much as mentioned; and the date of it is 1606, so that it lay conceal'd above four years, or (which is not improbable) was forg'd after the aforesaid Condemnation, and purposely antedated, that they might seem to be before-hand with

with the *Sorbon* and the Parliament, and obviate the Suspicion of being forced to condemn him by the Exigency and Necessity of their Affairs. And yet, even after this pretended Sentence, they could not forbear to shew their kindness to him: Father Cotton's Apologist confesses that *Mariana* was indeed mistaken, when he said the Consent of the Learned was sufficient to authorise a private Man to destroy a Tyrant, and this is all he blames him for. *Eudæmon* is hard put to it, to excuse, and yet to disallow him. He says, p. 96. That the Opinion of *Mariana* is approv'd by no one else of the Society, and yet he had acknowledg'd before ¶, that the Book was Licens'd by the ¶ Pag. 52. Visitor, and three of the Order; but this it may be is no good Argument that they allowed the Doctrine of it; for it has been clearly made out in the Case of *M. de Meaux*, that a good Catholick may give his Approbation for a Book, tho himself be of a different Opinion from it. But *Eudæmon* goes further, he gives a large account out of his Apology for *Garnet*, of *Mariana's* Opinion, where he says all he can to excuse him; That he delivers himself modestly and cautiously; that he seems not over-confident of his Doctrine; that he submits all to the Judgment of the Church, and professes he is ready to Recant if he be mistaken; and that therefore he cannot be guilty of heretical Obstinacy. He endeavours also to diminish the Odium of his Doctrine, by shewing it is not so bad as 'tis usually represented: That he does not allow a private Man at all Adventures to Murder every Prince he esteems a Tyrant; but that he must first be condemn'd as such by the Voice of all the People; that publick Judgment against him must be expected, if it can be procured; and that after all, if the States cannot Assemble to Condemn and Depose him, the Fact must not yet be attempted without the Approbation of the most Learned and Pious Men that can be consulted. And then, after he had given as fair a Representation of his Opinion as he possibly could, he makes this Reflection on it. ¶ But these things, as they are gallantly and bravely Spoken, so they cannot be accommodated to the common Practice; and so he goes on at large to Censure his Opinion, not as impious and detestable, but only as impolitick, rash and dangerous, and as a Speculation too subtle and refin'd to be reduc'd to Practice.

¶ Sed hæc ut splendide magnificèque dicuntur, ita ad communem Vitæ usum accommodari non possunt. *Eud.*

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

2. This Opinion so unhappily miscarrying, the Jesuits substituted another, not less Treasonable and Pernicious, but only as they thought less Scandalous and better Grounded than the former. And the Sum of it is, That if a lawful Prince degenerates into a Tyrant, the Nobles and the People by the Authority residing in them, may lawfully Depose him, and chuse another to succeed him; and this Rebellious Doctrine they ground upon such Maxims as these, That all Monarchical Government was originally founded upon mutual Compacts between King and People; That if a Prince by Tyranny violate his Part of the Compact, the People are not obliged to theirs. The Princes are only Trustees for the People; that the People have still a right to resume the Power they entrusted them with; and to sum up all in the Words of * *Bellarmin*, (the grand Abettor of all Republican and Deposing Principles) That *'tis the Consent of the People that Constitutes Kings or Consuls, or other Magistrates over them; and that if there be lawful Cause, the Multitude may change the Kingdom into an Aristocracy or Democracy, and so on the contrary.* 'Tis needless to aggravate the Villany of this Doctrine; the very mentioning of it, must necessarily inspire all the Lovers of Peace and Loyalty, with the greatest degree of Rage and Abhorrence against such impious Dogmatizers and Subverters of all Order and Government in the World. Yet the Books which have broach'd and maintain'd these fundamental Articles of Rebellion, were written by the most Celebrated Authors of this Loyal Society; and are still those which they most value, admire, and commend to their Disciples. 'Twould swell this Paper too much to stuff it up with numerous Quotations to this purpose. In short, they seem to be unanimous in asserting this Doctrine; and I know not whether any one Jesuit can be produc'd, that has *bona fide* gainsaid or deny'd it.

3. But thirdly, to make sure work at last, there is not any Article of Faith, in which they are more universally agreed, than they are in this; That the Pope is invested with a Power of deposing Tyrants, especially in the Case of Heresy and Persecution against Catholics. This they think themselves obliged to believe with a Divine Faith, as having the Stamp and Signature of an Article of Faith upon it, *viz.* the Declaration
of

* *Bellarmin. de Laicis lib. 3. c. 6.*

Pendet à consensu Multitudinis Constitueretur super se Regem vel Consules, vel alios Magistratus, ut patet; & si Causa legitima adsit, potest Multitudo mutare Regnum in Aristocratiam aut Democratiam, & è contrario.

of the Church, which they esteem the formal Reason of Faith, and into which they ultimately resolve it. Hence it is, that for Instance, † *Lessius*, ‖ *Suarez*, and ∴ *Santarellus*, do all agree in urging this Argument for it, That the Deposing Power is grounded upon the Decrees of General Councils, and universal Tradition; and that therefore, if it be unlawful, General Councils, Tradition, and the whole Catholick Church have erred; and consequently, that this Doctrine is as certain as it is, That the Church cannot err, and that the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against it; and in short, that to believe the contrary, is down-right Heresy, and an Error as dangerous to the Church, as the denial of any other Article of the Christian Religion. At this rate is it that they scrue up their Doctrine, till they make the Christian Faith, and Church, and even the veracity of Jesus Christ himself, to stand and fall with it; As if his Promises could not be verified, unless the Pope have all the Kingdoms of the World given unto him, and be set over the Nations to Build, and to Plant, and to Root out, to pull down, and to Destroy; and so close does this Doctrine sit upon the Jesuit, that he cannot part with it, even when he is vindicating the Loyalty of his Order. Thus *Eudæmon* affirms it to be the Doctrine of the whole Catholick Church, and takes pains to prove it out of *Bellarmin*, and his own Apology for *Garnet*; and so having establish'd in the Pope a judicial Power over Princes, he at last desires them not to be offended, nor to think it any Disparagement to them, * *If when the Necessity of the Church require it, they are brought as Criminals to the Bar, before such Judges as his Holiness appoints them.*

It is here further to be observ'd, That besides these three Opinions, I have now laid down, there have not been wanting some great men of that Order, that have insinuated it to be lawful for a private Person to kill a Tyrant in the Defence of his Life against him. *Becanus* delivers his Opinion in this Point somewhat scrupulously: *Subjects*, says he, *ought to obey a Tyrant by Administration, and not to kill him, unless perhaps for the necessary Defence of their Lives; but Seb. Prif-*

† *Lessius*, *Diffusio Decreti Conc. Lateran.* p. 89.

‖ *Suarez*, *Defensio fidei*, l. 3. c. 23. sect. 16.

∴ *Santarellus*, *Tractat. de hæc.* p. 296.

* *Neque reges exui jure suo se credant si iudicibus quos ille constituit, cum id Ecclesiæ necessitas exigit, rei fiantur, p. 59.*

Apud Eudæm. p. 22. Subditi debent Tyranno ratione Administrationis obtemperare & non interficere, nisi forte ob necessariam Vitæ defensionem.

sius

Ibidem 23. Ego sane meliorum plurimumque hunc sensum esse teneo, neminem privatum extra necessitatem se suosque defendendi manus inferre posse legitimo Principi ante publicam judicialiter latam sententiam qua Tyrannus hostisque reipub. declaratur.

sus is not so modest: I, says he, hold this to be the Opinion of the more, and the better, That no private Person may lay hands upon a lawful Prince, before a publick Sentence judicially pronounc'd, whereby he is declared a Tyrant, and an Enemy to the Commonwealth,

save only when he is under a necessity of defending himself. Lessius, Molina, and Suarez, might be here added; but what is already alledged is sufficient to prove that this Opinion is taught by the Jesuits. It is also to be noted, that those among them who reject Mariana's Opinion, and yet assert the lawfulness of deposing a Tyrannical Prince by a publick definitive Sentence, either of the Pope or States; do yet by consequence allow it lawful for a private Person to destroy him; this is generally insinuated plainly enough by those, who affirm it unlawful for a private Man to kill a Tyrant before publick Sentence. Whence it evidently follows, that after such a Sentence it is lawful to do it; || for as Parsons, our English Jesuit, long since argued, A condemned Tyrant may lawfully be slain by a private Man authoriz'd to do it; for then he is no longer to be considered as a private Man, because he doth it by publick Authority of the Commonwealth, as doth the Executioner that cutteth off a Nobleman's head by Order and Authority of the publick Magistrate. And if this Reason be not sufficient to settle an Assassins Judgment, † Suarez,

¶ Foulis p.
101.

† Suarez Defensio fidei, l. 6. c. 4. Sect. 14. 18.

Tyrannus ratione Administrationis non potest à privatis interim quamdiu manet Princeps. *Lessius de Just. lib. 2. c. 9. dub. 4. Sect. 10. & 12. Adde si tantum excreseat Tyrannis ut non amplius videatur tolerabilis, nec ullum aliud remedium superfit, primum à Rep, vel comitiis Regni, vel alio habente Autoritatem esse deponendum, & hostem Declarandum, ut in ipsius personam liceat quicquid attentare, tum enim definit esse princeps.*

and ∴ Lessius will furnish him with another, in which he cannot but acquiesce; That the Pope or States when they depose a Tyrant, degrade him from being a King, and therefore after that Deposition he has no true Title to the Crown, but becomes an Usurper, and by consequence may be slain by any private Man: That it is not indeed lawful to Assassinate a Tyrant, as long as he remains a lawful Prince; but when he is deposed, he is no longer to be look'd upon under that Character, and then it may be lawful to attempt any

any thing against his Person, because he ceases to be a Prince. So that after all this subtilizing and refining upon the Principles of Rebellion, the difference between *Mariana's* Doctrine, and that of the other Jesuits, amounts, at last, only to this; That *Mariana* pronounces it lawful for a private Man to stab a Prince when the Voice of the People, and the concurring Suffrage of the Learned declare him a Tyrant, without staying for the formality of a publick Sentence, which is to be presum'd, where it cannot well be procur'd; whereas the greatest part of his Order require first a publick definitive Sentence to depose him, and then authorize any one to be his Executioner. The former is for murdering Princes, as *Henry the 4th of France* was murdered by the hands of private Assassins, without an antecedent Sentence. The others are for arraigning and condemning them by a Court of Justice, and a solemn Pageantry of Law, as *K. Charles the Martyr* was, and then executing them by authorized and consecrated Villains.

And thus we have the whole extent of the Jesuitical Doctrine, concerning the Killing of Kings, which at the first view appears so horrid and impious, that it is not capable of any Aggravation. And it would be one of the most unaccountable things in the World, that a Religious Order of Men, who pretend to the greatest degree of Christian Perfection, and that would be esteemed the peculiar Followers of the blessed Jesus, should yet be the Preachers of such Unchristian Opinions and Doctrines of Devils: But that we have been long since forewarn'd, that Satan himself is sometimes transform'd into an Angel of Light. And the experience of all Ages assures us, that such Pretenders to extraordinary Sanctity, have been ever the fittest Instruments of Treason and Rebellion. And lastly, it is not to be wondred at, that a Society of Men, wise enough in their Generation, should suit their Principles to their Designs, and become the Teachers of such Doctrines as apparently tend to the attaining that end for which their Order was design'd, (*viz.*) The advancement of the Papal Monarchy, and the exalting it above all the Kingdoms and Governments of the World.

But notwithstanding these execrable Opinions have been publish'd and avow'd to all the World by the greatest Men of

M

their

'A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

their Order: Yet, whenever it has been their Interest to be thought of otherwise, and Apologies for their Loyalty were necessary to be written; they have never failed to set a good face upon the matter, and endeavour'd to reconcile Christ and *Belial*, Light and Darknes together. And tho these forc'd Apologies have serv'd only to shew, how impossible it is for a Jesuit to vindicate the Loyalty of his Doctrine; yet Face and Confidence, Artifice and Insinuation, have usually supplied the want of Reason and Argument, and so the Teachers of King-killing Doctrines, have at last past for Men of Loyal Principles, and been receiv'd into the Bosoms of Princes, whose Throats they have expos'd to the Butchery of every bloody Zealot.

But how little the Jesuits have to say for themselves, we have now a pregnant Instance before us. The Author of *Anti-Cotton* has here charg'd them with teaching the lawfulness of killing and deposing Kings, and selected some Passages out of their approved Authors to make good the Accusation. Let us therefore now proceed to examine, how his Answerers defend their Order, and what Pleas they offer in Vindication of it, and then I doubt not but it will appear how indefensible a Cause they had undertaken,

Eudemou, p. 11, 12. Nego non modo in reges moderatos & æquos, sed ne in eos quidem qui in regno quod jure obtinent tyrannice tamen dominantur, quamvis infideles, hæreticos, persecutores Ecclesiæ, etiam religionis causâ privato cuiquam à Jesuitis jus ullum tribui.

I. Then to the Charge it self, it is replied, *That the Jesuits do not teach it lawful for a private Man to Kill a lawful Prince, tho never so great a Tyrant, Heretick, or Persecutor of the Church, under Colour of Religion.* So *Eudemou* expressly, and to the same purpose the Agologist.

But how insufficient this Plea is, a few brief Reflections on it will abundantly evince. For

1. What they affirm in general, that no such Power is attributed by Jesuits to any private Person, is notoriously false, as appears from what has been already said concerning the Opinion of *Mariana*, and its being approved by divers others of their Order.

2. Granting what they affirm to be true; this plea discharges them only from the guilt of the first opinion, and leaves the

against the Cavils of his Answerers.

11

the imputation of the other opinions in its full force against them; and therefore the disclaiming of that first opinion will not do their business; for that is only a Branch of *Anti-Cotton* Accusation; and what he charges upon them in general, That under the Cloak and Colour of Religion, and when they judge it necessary for the good of the Church, they think it Lawful to Depose and make away Princes, will be sufficiently made good, if it can be proved that (suppose they don't allow private persons, as such, to do it) they do yet Ascribe to the Pope, to Subordinate Magistrates, or to the whole body of the People, a power of Deposing Princes by publick Sentence, and then of putting it in Execution against them. And accordingly it is further to be observed,

3. That by a private person here, they only mean such an one, as is not Commission'd to perform the Execution, but attempts it out of some private Impulse of his own, without any publick Warrant and Authority to justify him in it; and therefore still it is owned, that a private person may lawfully execute a condemned Tyrant; and this the Answerers are so far from denying, that they both of them alledg divers of their Authors that expressly own it. It will be sufficient, to give two or three instances of this. The words of *Em. Sa.*

Eudæmon || speaks plainly enough to this purpose. *A Lawful Prince, says he, that Governs Tyrannically, cannot be Depriv'd without publick judgment; but when Sentence is pronounced, any one may be the Executioner of it.* And

so also Cardinal † *Tolet* is produced, affirming that it is not † *Ibid.* lawful to kill a Tyrant by Administration, without publick Authority; and *Jac. Gretser* ||; That it is the more common || *Ibid.* p. 23. opinion, that it is never Lawful to lay hands upon a Prince transform'd into a Tyrant, before publick and authoritative Judgment be Pronounc'd against him, whereby he is declared an enemy to the Republick, and so deprived of his Kingdom by those that have a right to do it. There are many other of their * Authors cited by *Eudæmon* and the Apologist, which in effect do unanimously assert the same thing, and which *Father Cotton* had before urged in his Declaratory Letter, to

|| P. 18. Tyrannicè Gubernans justè acquisitum dominium non potest Spoliari sine publico judicio, latâ verò sententiâ potest quisq; fieri Executor.

* *Molina. Delrio. Salmeron. Azorius. Valentia Lessius. Heissius. Richeomus. Becanus. Serarius.*

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

shew that the Jesuits did not hold it Lawful to Murder a Prince that abus'd his Power unto Tyranny. And such are the Testimonies which these Jesuits, and after them some others of their Order, have appeal'd to, for the Vindication of their Doctrine: tho there can be nothing plainer, than that they all hold it Lawful, first to Depose a Prince who shall be judged a Tyrant, and then after Sentence to Assassinate and Destroy him; and to shew what an admirable Apology this is for their Loyalty, I shall reduce it into the form of an Address to a Prince that suspects them.

'Tho our Enemies have Maliciously Represented us as Men
'of Treasonable Principles, that hold it Lawful to Depose and
'Murder the Anointed of the Lord; we yet beseech You not
'to give Credit to their Calumnies. Far be it from us to have
'the least thoughts of broaching and maintaining such an
'Hellish Principle. We have on the contrary (excepting only
'some few of our Order) unanimously maintained that it is an
'unwarrantable presumption for any private person to embroil

'his hands in the Blood of Kings, before they be Condemned
'by those that have Authority to do
'it. *We know and constantly teach,*
'that not only a Just cause, but also
'a lawful Power is required to justify
'the Execution of the meanest person;
'and far be it from you to think that
'we put Princes (whose Persons have
'been by all Nations esteemed sacred)

Scimus non iustam modo causam cædis,
sed legitimam etiam Protestatem requiri ut
quis jure occidatur: Neq; deterioris condi-
tionis principes jure omnium gentium sacro
sanctos quam latrones aut sicarios facimus,
in quos quamvis extrema omnia meritos,
privatis tamen nullum jus facimus. Eudæ.
p. 33.

'into a worse condition than even Thieves and Murderers, whom we
'allow not private men to Execute. True it is, we have constantly
'taught, that a Prince may by his Holiness, or by his own Sub-
'jects be Lawfully Deposed. But still we affirm, that it is not
'our Doctrine that they may be kill'd before Sentence is past
'against them. And then forasmuch as he ceases to be a Prince,
'it is only a private and common Malefactor, and not the sacred
'person of a Prince, that we expose to slaughter. And there-
'fore since neither our Doctrine nor our Practice can justly be
'stained with the imputation of Disloyalty; we doubt not but
'You will Extend Your Favour and Bounty towards us: which
'if You shall do, and the Pope not command the contrary, we
'shall

' shall demean our selves as becomes those who desire to be
' esteemed Your most Loyal and Obedient Subjects. This is an
exact Transcript of the Jesuits Apology for themselves, and
let every one judg how well it acquits them.

II. But that I may not seem to omit any thing which the
Answerers of *Anti-Cotton* have thought fit to Reply, and which
deserves to be Considered; I proceed to Examine the objecti-
ons against those few passages which the Author of this
Treatise had Collected out of their Books, to justify his charge
against them. And because these objections for the most part
consist only of some little cavils and trifling exceptions, and
so are of no great consequence as to the main design of our
Author; I shall here propose only some few of them, refer-
ring others to be considered under the head of particular
Doctrines. And

First, To that passage of *Ribadensira* urged by *Anti-Cotton*,
as approving the Parricide of *James Clement*, *Eudamon* and
the Apologist do both object, that the words do not imply an
approbation of the fact; because it is certain when any Prince,
especially a wicked one, is Murdered, it is to be look'd upon as
a just judgment of God upon him, tho the person that com-
mits the Murder is nevertheless to be esteemed an execrable Vil-
lain for it. This gloss seems plausible enough; but if we take
all together it will not excuse him. 'Tis evident that the
crime for which the Jesuits ascribe the Murder of that
King to the just Judgment of God, was his not heartily en-
deavouring to destroy the *Hugonots*, and not joyning with the
Holy League to extirpate Heresie. And this we know is with
them a sufficient cause to Legitimate the Deposing and Muder-
ing a Prince; and therefore the most natural meaning of such
words, when they come from a Jesuit, is, that he was justly
Murder'd by the hands of a simple young Monk set on by the
judgment of God. And this Sence is most agreeable to the
whole Speech of *Sixtus* the 5th, in which he Magnifies the He-
roick Exploit of this simple Fryar, beyond those of *Eleazer*
and *Judith*, and frequently ascribes it to the particular provi-
dence and disposition of Almighty God. And so also to *Bel-
larmin's* Commendation of this Assassin, who calls him *Sacra-
rum Virum*, and affirms, That God avenged his anointed the Pope,
when

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

Ultus est deus Christum suum dum per alium sacratum Virum regem eundem non sine manibus, divinæ providentiæ miraculo interfecit. Bellarm. Tom. 7. Resp. ad Apolog. pro jar fid. p. 671.

when by him he miraculously destroyed that King, not without the peculiar assistance of the Divine Providence. But to be short, if any one now should affirm, that King Charles the Martyr,

because he did not endeavour with all his might to Extirpate Popery, was by the just Judgment of God Condemn'd by a Court of Justice, and then died upon a Scaffold; I appeal to any one, whether such words would not be liable to be interpreted as a manifest approbation of that execrable Murder?

Vid Ep. Ca-
saub ad Front.
p. 23. & de-
inceps.
* Catalogus
Script. Soc.
Jesu. p. 38.

To those passages out of the *Amphitheatre of Honour*, compil'd by *Scribanus*, disguising himself under the feign'd Name of *Clarus Bonarscius*, they both reply, that it cannot be prov'd, that *Scribanus* was the Author of it, and therefore they are not bound to account for him. * But *Ribadeneira* in his Catalogue of the Writers of their Society, printed but a Year before, Ascribes that Book to *Scribanus*, and commends him for it: So that here we have a Specimen of the Sincerity of the Jesuits; they can freely own an Author, when it is for the Credit of the Society; and then confidently renounce him, when they dare not defend him. But here these Jesuits had Father *Cottons* example to Justify him, who (when the Kings Advocate shewed to Henry the 4th the places in this *Amphitheatre of Honour* which encouraged the Murdering of Princes) replied, That the Book was Printed at Geneva, and Father'd upon the Jesuits, to render the Society odious. And yet afterwards (as the said Advocate relates) openly commended *Scribanus* as the Author of it, distributed many Copies, and extol'd it as a Book of singular Profit to those who Learned the Latin Tongue.

Hospinian
Hist. Jesuit.
p. 133. & 134.

To the Quotation out of *Bellarmin*, *Eudæmon* does not deny the Popes Sovereign Power of disposing Kingdoms, to be the opinion of *Bellarmin* and all the Jesuits, but only cavils at omitting the words immediately following (if it be necessary for the Salvation of Souls) which, says he, would have prevented all objections against that Doctrine, and shew'd upon what solid grounds they maintain it. And so also to that which follows out of *Gretser*, he only blames him for suppressing those words of *Gretser*, If the Prince Rules Tyrannically, and extirpates the

the true Religion; which, says he, would have convinced all Men of the necessity of deposing him. So that according to this Author, If a Prince goes about to extirpate Popery, 'tis as clear as the Sun, that he may and must be depos'd; nay, according to the *Lateran Council*, he incurs the same Punishment, if he does not extirpate Heresy. What follows in *Eudæmon*, is no less plain and ingenuous.

Now, says he, in that you reprehend *Gretser* for saying, that if the Pope use his Deposing Power discreetly and warily, it is a meritorious Work: This is downright Madness; for all his Power being given to the Pope for Edification, he does then discreetly use it, when the exercise of it promotes the Edification of the Church. And who can doubt that believes any Work to be meritorious, that those acts which are done by the Pastor of the Church for the benefit of it, are truly such?

To the Passage of *Tolet*, *Eudæmon* replies, 1. That the word *Subditi* is not in *Tolet*; 'tis true, it is not; but *Anti Cotton* here does not cite the Words, but the * Sense and Doctrine of *Tolet*, which he has faithfully done, as appears from his citing immediately after the famous Canon of *Nos Sanctorum*, which absolves Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance to excommunicate Princes. 2. He adds, That the Subject is indeed freed from the Obligation of his Oath to an excommunicated Prince, but not from that of natural Allegiance; as if the Obligation of natural Fealty were more Sacred and Inviolable, than that of a Religious Oath; and he that assumes the Power of dissolving the one, had not as much right to dispence with the other. To the other Quotation out of the same Author, That a Person excommunicated cannot exercise an Act of Jurisdiction. The Apologist blames our Author for leaving out *absque*

peccato, which is joyned to it; and hence he infers, that it is *Tolet's* Opinion, That is it only a Sin for a Person excommunicate, to exercise Jurisdiction; but that still his Acts are to all purposes

Eudæmon p. 93. Jam quod reprehendit dictum à Gretsero. Si jure suo prudenter & circumspectè Pontifex utatur, opus esse meritorium planè deliras. Cum enim potestatem omnem suam in ædificationem acceperit à Christo, tunc prudenter circumspectè quæ eî utitur; cum juris ejus usurpatio facit ad ædificationem Ecclesiæ. Cui autem dudum esse potest, qui ullum modo opus meritorium agnoscat, quæ a Pastoribus fiunt in bonum Ecclesiæ ea meritoria esse?

* *Tolet* 1mo l. instruc. Sacer. c. 13. Sect. 7. Qui tenebantur alias obnoxii Sacramento fidelitatis vel juramenti liberantur tali vinculo si si inciderit in Excommunicationem.

Tolet *ibid.* Sect. 5. Excommunicatus non potest coercere actum jurisdictionis absque peccato, immo si publica est Excommunicatio facta, sententiæ nullæ sunt.

purposes valid. But the very next Words of the Cardinal, affirm the contrary. For if, says he, the Excommunication be made publick, his judicial Acts are null.

These are the most material Objections, which they urge against the Citations of *Anti-Cotton*: I shall only further take notice of what they say to those two Books, which are but just mention'd by *Anti-Cotton*. The first is that famous Pamphlet, *De justa abdicatione*, Hen. 3. published immediately after the Murder of that Prince, in which all the Principles of Treason are dogmatically maintain'd, the Rebellion of the Holy League justified, and the Parricide of *Jaques Clement* applauded. 'Tis true, (as the Answerers reply) the Author of this detestable Book was no Jesuit; but was afterward known to be one *Jean Boucher*, a *Sorbon* Doctor, and Curat of *Paris*; neither does *Anti-Cotton* affirm him to be of that Society; but only suspects it came out of their Forge, because it was printed at *Lyons*, where the Jesuits were in a manner absolute, and had the known and usual Mark of their Society upon it. And besides the Book it self contains in it nothing but what is exactly agreeable to the Maxims of the Jesuits, and the Positions of the most celebrated Writers of their Order. And the Author himself, tho no Jesuit, had yet some Relation to them, as having had his Education in the Colledge of *Clermont*, where he was first poisoned by those Doctors of Rebellion; and afterwards (which was a known Practice of the Jesuits) transplanted into the University to propagate the same Sanguinary Divinity among the Members of that Body also.

The other is *Franciscus Verona*, who writ an Apology to justify the attempt of *John Chastel* upon *Henry 4.* him also the Answerers deny to be a Jesuit, neither has *Anti-Cotton* any where affirm'd it. I shall only set down what Mr. *Foulis* has observed concerning him, That about the same time there was a *French* Jesuit of the same Name, who afterwards writ some Books against the Protestants, but whether they were both the same Person, he cannot determine. Yet *Sanderson*, he says, in his History of King *James* the 6th, does positively affirm that he was a Jesuit. He observes also, that the same year (*viz.*) 1595. that this Book was printed, one *Le Bell*, a Jesuit, was punished for endeavouring to convey one *Fran. Zoë Veron*, a Student of *Poitiers*,

Foulis p. 72,
and 102.

Poitiers, out of *France* which is also related by *Anti-Cotton*. But let them, if they please, affirm, that those are no more but slight Presumptions, which can prove nothing. Our Evidence against them, does not depend upon these two Authors. And allowing that they are not concern'd in them, the most they can make out, is, That the Jesuits were not the Authors of two the most impious Books that ever were written, tho they speak nothing but the Sense of their own approved Authors.

III. Another method which *Eudæmon* takes to vindicate his Order from the Charge advanced against them, is to appeal to divers publick Testimonies, which had been given of the Loyalty of their Principles; and the first he produces, is *Pelletarius*, an Author of whom we find this Character in *Thuanus*, That he was first a Soldier, and then a mercenary Writer, that observed no bounds, either in calumniating his Adversaries, or extolling his Friends; in a word, that he was a great Bigot for the Jesuits; and therefore it is not to be wondred if such an Author should give a favourable Character of them. And yet the Substance of what he says in their behalf, is only, That there is no harm in their Doctrine, as *Richeom* in his Apology had represented it. This *Richeom* was himself a Jesuit; and during the time of their Banishment out of *France*, wrote an Apology for their Order; and 'twould have been very hard if a Jesuit could not have said something for his Society, nor have lick'd over their monstrous Doctrines into some shape of Loyalty.

Thuan con-
tin. lib. 5. p.
258.

But that which they urge with the greatest Confidence, is the Speech of *Henry 4.* in Answer to an humble Remonstrance made to him by the Assessors of the Parliament of *Paris* against the Restitution of the Jesuits. In this Speech, there is a very honourable Character given of their Order; their Industry, Learning and Piety, are highly commended, the common Objections against them answer'd; their Behaviour in the Holy League, their Vow of Obedience to the Pope, and adhering to the Interest of *Spain* excus'd, and their Doctrines concerning killing Kings, and exempting the Clergy from Obedience to them, absolutely deni'd. But the Credit of this Testimony will be lost, if we consider, 1. That *Anno 1604.* when this

Ibid. lib. 4. p.
203.

N

Speech

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

Speech is pretended to be made, the King then was become their Friend, and was resolved by all means to be reconcil'd to that ingrateful Society, that so he might free himself from the fears he was always in, of being assassinated by them; and therefore, ever after, he was their great Advocate and Patron,

Ibid. l. 3. p. 97. Solitus erat dicere se quotidie inaurare eos quos sibi maximè infensos expertus esset, ut auro suæ bonitatis malitiæ eorum plumbum corrigeret.

and continually heaped new Favours upon them; It being an usual saying of his, *That he daily obliged those whom he had experienced to be his most inveterate Enemies, that so by his goodness*

to them, he might extirpate their malice against him. And much less will it be for their Credit, when it appears, 2^{dly}, That this is only a sham Speech impudently forg'd and published by the Jesuits under the King's Name. So *Thuanus*, 'tis plain, accounted it; for after he has at large set down the true Remonstrance of the Senate; he adds, that the Jesuits Friends published another Summary of an Oration, made against the Jesuits, *Quam ipsi confixerant*, which themselves had forged, together with the King's Answer to it. So also *Martilier*, Advocate of the University of *Paris*, in his Pleas against the Jesuits, directly charges them before the Parliament with the Forgery of this Supposititious Speech, which he says, *That to impose upon Forreigners, they also published in the Latin and Italian Tongues; and that Gretser had translated it into German, and Possévin had inserted it in his Bibliotheca, that a Monument of this imposture might be transmitted unto Posterity also.* And so manifest was this Forgery, that *Montbolone* the Advocate of the Jesuits, had nothing to say to it, in his long Answer to the Speech of *Martilier*; tho he omits almost nothing else that had been urg'd against them. And yet after this publick Conviction of the Cheat, the Jesuits (with a modesty peculiar to that Order) have not been ashamed to appeal frequently to this Speech, as an irrefragable Testimony of the Innocence and Loyalty of their Society.

IV. But lastly, That which the Answerer seems most to Triumph in, as the clearest and most unexceptionable Vindication of themselves, is the known Decree of *Claudius Aquaviva* their General, made in the year 1610. *Wherein he strictly charges*

charges all the Members of his Society, by Virtue of that Holy Obedience they had vowed unto him, That thenceforth none of them should presume either in their publick or private Lectures, or Advices; and much less in the Books they should write, to affirm, That it

was lawful for any Person under any pretext of Tyranny whatsoever, to kill Kings or Princes, or to contrive their Death. And then he warns all the Provincials to take care, That this Decree be religiously observed under Pain of being depriv'd of their Offices. This is the Substance of that Decree; and how little it will serve to vindicate the Society from the Doctrines imputed to them, will, I hope, appear from what follows. 1. It is to be observed, That the Decree does not pretend to condemn the Doctrine of King-killing it self, as impious and unlawful, but only prohibits the maintaining it, either in their Books, Lectures or Discourses. There were many of those Authors, who have positively asserted the lawfulness of deposing and destroying Kings degenerated into Tyrants, which had been Licensed by *Aquaviva* himself; and it is not to be imagined, that he designed to condemn a Doctrine, which he himself, and his Society were engaged to maintain. But he saw, that their Enemies in *France* made great Advantage of it, to the Prejudice of their Interest there, and that Destruction was in a manner hanging over the head of his Order for it; and therefore it was thought best to accommodate themselves to the present Exigency, and for some time to Silence a Doctrine that had almost ruin'd them: And so the utmost that can be made of this silencing Decree is, That they had so much Wit, as not to maintain a Doctrine, when their Brains were in danger for it. But 2. it is not improbable that the Doctrine of *Mariana* is here only intended to be silenced, That it is lawful for a private Person to kill a Tyrant before judicial Sentence. 'Tis evident, that the words may be interpreted, so as to imply no more. For *cuiusque personæ*, cannot comprehend more than *nulli particulari*; now *Gregory de Valentia* tells us, That 'tis not lawful for any particular man (which is all one, as any Person whatsoever in the Decree) *particulari licet eum occidere, nam eum tunc coercere pertinet ad remp. quæ posset iure oppugnare illum, & vocare in subsidium cives.*

Eudemus p. 39. Ne quis deinceps nostræ Societatis publicè aut privatim prælegendo seu consulendo, multo etiam minus libros conscribendo affirmare præsumat licitum esse cuicumque personæ quocunque prætextu Tyrannidis Reges aut Principes occidere, &c.

Valentia Tomi.
3. disp. 5. q. 8.
punct. 3. Nulli
to

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton.

to kill a Tyrant; but then he adds, for that belongs to the Republick, who have a right to Destroy him, and call all their Members to assist them. So that the Words of this Prohibition do in effect say no more, than that Author (who was Licens'd by Gregory 14.) has done, That it is not lawful for any private Person to destroy a Tyrant. And this will be the more confirm'd when it is added, 3. That notwithstanding this Decree, the Jesuits still continued to compile and publish Books that dogmatically maintained the Doctrine of deposing and killing Princes, by publick Authority. It was hardly two years since this Declaration was made, when the Book of *Becanus* the Jesuit, entituled, *Controversia Anglicana de potentia, Regis & Papæ*, was printed with *Allowance* at *Ments*. Out of this Book, a Doctor of the *Sorbon* collected eleven Propositions, in which all the Reasonable Principles of the Jesuits are asserted; That the Pope can Excommunicate and Depose Kings, and absolve their Subjects from all Obligation of Duty and Obedience to them. That the High Priest in the *Old Testament*, could in some Cases punish Kings with Death; and that the Pope had, at least, as great a Power now under the Gospel. That all Princes that violate the Priviledges of Monasteries, were to be Deposed. That Emperors and Kings are placed as Dogs, to watch over the Flock of Christ; and if they prove Sluggish, or worry the Flock, the Pope, who is constituted Supreme Pastor of it, must remove them. And that, lastly, all Monarchies are founded upon a mutual Stipulation between Prince and People, whose Power is also so great, that they can exclude the Lawful Heir, and Elect another. We must remember, that those Maxims were fram'd with a particular aim at this Kingdom, and calculated for the Deposing our Kings as Hereticks, and substituting good Catholicks in their room; and tho the Pope by the earnest Intercessions of *France*, was obliged to Censure this Book; yet he does not condemn it as impious and heretical, but only as containing many things false, temerarious, scandalous, and respectively seditious; without specifying what those things are, and so in effect condemning nothing at all, but leaving every one at Liberty of maintaining any of the Doctrines contained in it.

Thuan. cont.
lib. 5. p. 315.

And

And so little regard was had to this Illusory Decree, that two Years after that, viz. An. 1614, it was again dispensed with for the sake of so great a man as *Suarez*; who then Published at *Cologne* his ‡ Defence of the Catholick and Apostolical Faith, (that is, the Power of Deposing Kings, &c.) against the Errors of the *English*, Sect. 1. And that it may appear, how constantly the Jesuits have adhered to their Beloved Doctrine of Rebellion, it may not be superfluous to give a brief account of some of the positions of this so much admired Author, whom the Jesuits value as the greatest Ornament and Glory of their Order, and would rather expose twenty Kings to Slaughter, than lose the credit of him.

‡ Defensio fidei Catholicæ & Apostolicæ adversus Anglicanæ sectæ errores. p. 25.

To give an exact account of all the Treasonable Contents of this Book, it would be necessary to Transcribe one half of it; it will therefore suffice to observe some of the most remarkable passages in him. In his third Book he endeavours at large to Establish the Catholick Supremacy of the Pope; and at length, Cap. 22. undertakes to prove, That all Christian Kings are his Subjects as well as other Christians; That by Virtue of that Power, the Pope hath a Civil Jurisdiction over their Kingdoms; can correct or revoke all Laws that he shall judge contrary to good manners, §. 10. Or to any part of the Canon-Law, §. 11. (So that all Laws Indulging Liberty of Conscience, or made for the preservation of the Protestant Religion, are hereby revokable at the pleasure of the Pope, because contrary to those Canons that Decree the Excommunicating of Heresie.) That he has an indirect Power of altering Laws that are purely Civil, if they give occasion to Sin, §. 12. And can Annul all Laws made by the Civil Powers concerning matters Ecclesiastical, tho such Laws are in themselves Null, because without the Sphere of Civil Jurisdiction, and so Enacted by an incompetent Authority, §. 13. That he can likewise rescind all unjust Sentences of Courts of Judicature, and call any Temporal Cause to himself, when 'tis in a case necessary to any Spiritual ends, §. 14. And that lastly, he has a right, when he thinks it necessary, to command Princes to become the Executioners of his Will and Pleasure. And Cap. 23. not content with all this, he gives him also a Coercive Power over Kings that are wicked and incorrigible,

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

ble, especially pertinacious Hereticks and Schismatics; because a Directive Power without a Coactive, would signify nothing: And this Power he does not confine to Ecclesiastical Censures, but maintains that it may be also extended to the inflicting Temporal Penalties, and even deprivation of their Kingdoms; and this he proves, first, From *Pasce Oves*, and *Quodcunque Ligaveris*, §. 10, 11. From St. Peter's Killing *Ananias*, §. 12. And St. Paul's delivering that incestuous person to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, §. 13. 2ly, He confirms it by the authority and practice of the Church, and the Decrees of the General Councils of *Lions*, and the *Lateran*, under *Innocent* the 3d. and thence concludes, That 'tis as certain as the Inerrability of the Church it self, §. 14, 15, 16. And 3dly, He proves it by Reasons taken from the Absolute Necessity of such a Power in the Supreme Pastor of the Church, both in respect of Emperors and Kings themselves, and of the People subject to them, §. 17. And this is the substance of his Doctrine concerning the Popes Directive, Coactive, and Vindictive Power over Kings. But in his 6th Book, wherein he pretends to Confute King *James's* Apology for the Oath of Allegiance, he does more particularly set himself to explicate and maintain in a Scholastick manner, the whole Doctrine of the Jesuits concerning the Deposing and Murdering of Kings, Cap. 2. He Affirms, That those Propositions implied in the Oath, that the Pope has not a power of Deposing Princes, and of Absolving their Subjects from their Allegiance, are erroneous, and contrary to Faith. And consequently, Cap. 3. That it is erroneous also to Affirm, That Subjects are bound to pay true Faith and Obedience to a Prince Deposed by the Pope. And then Cap. 4. in his Examination of that part of the Oath, wherein the Doctrine of Deposing and Murdering Princes is abjured as Impious and Heretical, he states the question about killing Lawful Kings that govern Tyrannically.

First then, He tells us, That among Christians, a Prince that draws his Subjects into Heresie or Schism, is to be reckoned as one of the first rank of Tyrants, §. 1. Then he lays down this position, §. 2. That such a Prince cannot Lawfully be Slain by any private person; but this Assertion he after qualifies and abates by declaring, §. 5. That a private man has
by

by the Law of Nature a Right to Defend his Life against a Prince that Assaults him, tho the Death of the Prince ensue upon it. And so also, §. 6. If a King does by force of Arms endeavour to Destroy a City, any private man in the Defence of the Community may then resist and Kill him. §. 14. He proceeds to Dispute whether a Lawful Prince may be killed by a private person after Sentence pronounced against him, which Assertion he there affirms may be founded on the Decree of the Council of *Constance*, which forbids private men to kill Tyrants, *Non expectat à Sententiâ vel Mandato judicis Cujuscunque*; and upon this Reason also, that the Aggressor does not then act upon private Authority, but in virtue of a publick Sentence; and that moreover, after Sentence is pronounced, he is no longer a Lawful King; and if he then retains the Kingdom by force, he Commences a Tyrant by Title, and may therefore be dealt with as such, and consequently be Killed by any private person whatsoever. This he propounds as a difficulty to be examined, and for the resolution of it, §. 15. He lays down this as unquestionable, That a Sovereign Prince may by publick Sentence be Deposed; and so enquires, with whom this Power is lodged; which he supposes to be in the Republick, and the Pope, in different respects, in the Republick, by virtue of the right it has to defend and preserve it self; which right he supposes to be reserved by the Original compact, wherein the People transferred their Power upon the Prince. But §. 16. He says, This power is lodged in the Pope, by virtue of that Jurisdiction which he has over Kings, as subject to him. But that this Prerogative might at last be in effect appropriated to his Lord God the Pope alone, he adds, §. 17. That tho Republicks considered in themselves, and not as composed of Christians, have an Independent Power of Defending themselves against Tyrants, and Deposing them; yet that Christian Communities cannot exercise this power, but with Subordination to the Supreme Pastor of the Church; both because he has a Power of Commanding them, not to Depose their King before he has taken Cognizance of the Cause; for 'tis his Duty to take care that the Souls of Men be not exposed to ruin, by unnecessary Tumults and Rebellions; and also, because he has a right of enjoying the Republick

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton.

Republick to Depose their King, when he judges it necessary for their spiritual good; and especially for the preventing Herefie and Schism. And so §. 18. he thus resolves the case, That after judicial sentence, they that pass it, may proceed actually to deprive the condemned Prince of his Kingdom, and may also lawfully kill him, if either the sentence extend to death, or he cannot be well deprived without it; and yet the deposed King is not immediately to be murdered by every private person, unless he be particularly commanded, or a general Commission, declared in the sentence it self, or in the Law, authorize him to it: But as to the Pope, he adds, That if he commissions none to drive a Prince, he has deposed, out of his Dominions, or else to kill him, then the right of executing the sentence, devolves upon him that is next in succession; but if there be none to claim the right of succeeding, it belongs to the Kingdom it self. But enough of this horrid and detestable Divinity, which is every where dispersed throughout this Book; what I have here collected, is sufficient to give a just Idea of this Author. But if these opinions be a part of the Catholick and Apostolick Faith, Infidelity, Herefie and Apostacy, are certainly very innocent things in comparison of it. And yet if the highest approbation can make Doctrines pass for current, as Catholick and Orthodox, this Book has a just title to be esteemed such; for it is approved by three Catholick Bishops, by a whole Catholick University, *viz. Alcala de Henares*, by the holy Inquisition, and the Provincial Jesuits of *Portugal* and *Germany*; and one of the Approvers does expressly affirm, that he found all things in it agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, Apostolical Traditions, General Councils, and Papal Decrees. The Jesuits to be sure thought them conformable to all these, as well as to their own Maxims, and therefore made no scruple to step over a Decree, of which they well enough knew the secret, and authorize a Book that so admirably defended the Catholick faith of their Order. I do not find that this pernicious Book was ever censured and condemned by any, but the Parliament of *Paris*, who were only a company of Laymen, and therefore not looked upon as competent Judges in those matters: But however they assumed such a power, and sentenced the Book to be burnt * by the Hangman, and prohibited the printing or selling of it; and decreed like.

* Thuanus
cont. Hist. p.
410.

likewise, that *Armandus, Cotton, Frinton* and *Firmondus* (the chief Fathers of the Society) should be summoned before them, and receive a Reprimand for suffering this Book to be printed, and brought to *Paris*, contrary to their own declaration, and their Generals decree; and that they should also be strictly enjoined to take care, that this Decree should be received and published again, and that they should more strictly look to the observation of it, otherwise they would proceed against them as guilty of High Treason, and disturbers of the publick peace; and this was the occasion of a second Decree of their General *Visselleschi*, Ann. 1616. wherein the former is ratified, and the Jesuits are forbidden to defend the lawfulness of * King-killing, either in writing or discourse. In this second * Ne quis Edition of their Decree, there is nothing new, it is liable to all quam scripta the same objections, and it was much alike observed; I shall vel sermone give two instances of this also: Anno 1625. out comes the doceat licitum esse cui-cunque per-sonæ quocun-que prætextu tyrannidis Reges occidere. Book of *Sanctarelus*, concerning Heresie, Schism, and Apostasy, printed at *Rome*, and after an examination of three of the Society, Licensed by *Martin Visselleschi*, then General of the Order, and the Master of the Sacred Palace; out of this Book † the Faculty at *Paris*, among divers others, extracted these Ap-† Censura facultatis The-ologice in li-brum Ant. Sanctarello. sertions; That the Pope can punish Heretical Kings with temporal punishments, and not only Excommunicate them, but also deprive them of their Dominions, and discharge their Subjects from all obedience to them; (and this he proves at large, Cap. 30. by ten Arguments, coincident for the most part with those of *Suarrez*); and that further, the Pope can proceed against them for other crimes also, if it be expedient, and depose them likewise, if they be either negligent and useless, or insufficient and incapable of governing. So that here we have the deposing power again asserted in its utmost latitude. But notwithstanding its approbation at *Rome*, || it was condemned || Formis: 646; in *France* by the Court of Parliament at *Paris*, and the eight 647. Alphonsus de Vargas Relatio de Stratagematis Jesuitarum, C. 56. Universities of that Kingdom; and some of the principal Jesuits themselves pretended by subscription to condemn him also; but this did not give satisfaction; so they were enjoined to con- fuse the Tenets of *Sanctarelus*, and write a Book against him; but this they declined, because they durst not carry on the Cheary so far as to write against a Book authorized by the Ge- neral.

neral. For that all these professions of renouncing those Doctrines, were nothing but meer Legerdemain, is evident from their own answers to the Interrogatories of the Court of Parliament, when some of them were conven'd before them; for being asked whether they approved the Contents of that Book, as their General had done; *F. Cotton* their Provincial and Rector of *Clermont*, in the name of the rest of the Society, answered, *They did not; that their Society did indeed believe them at Rome; but that ought not to be imputed to them in France, being of another persuasion.* And being again asked, whether they did not believe as their General? he answered, *our General living at Rome, is not to be supposed to contradict what is believed there: What do you believe then?* said the Court; *the quite contrary,* says the Father; and what would you believe if you were at Rome? *We would change our minds with the Country, and believe as they did at Rome.* To which some of the Court answered, *Have these men then one conscience at Rome, and another at Paris? God keep us from such Confessors.* And this is no more than what his Predecessor had answered before, when Subscription was in the like case required of them, That their Constitutions * allowed them to observe the Rules of the place where they lived; but that he could not undertake, that the General at Rome should subscribe also. So conveniently have the Jesuits contrived their Rules, that they can be allowed to change, and shift, and accommodate themselves to all times and places, so as to alter their opinions with the Climate, and abjure Doctrines in one Country, which they will maintain as Catholick and Apostolick in another. The other instance, I shall produce, is the Book of *F. Mabony* a Jesuit, intitled an *Apologetical Disputation concerning the right of the Kingdom of Ireland, in behalf of the Irish Catholicks, against the English Heretick.* This Book † Father *Welsh* says was printed 1645. *Permissu Superiorum*; and there cites these passages out of it, 'That supposing, not granting, that the Kings of England were (as the English falsely pretend) true and lawful Kings of Ireland; yet nevertheless the States of the Kingdom might, and ought to have deposed them, when they became Hereticks and Tyrants. And then it follows, 'For this right of deposing Tyrannical Princes, resides in every Kingdom and Republick; now if to the consent of the Kingdom, the Authority

* *Thu. Hist.*
Contr. p. 219.

† *Vindication*
of the Irish
Remonstranc.
p. 736, 737.

'thority Apostolical should be added, who but a Heretick or a
 ' Fool will dare to deny that which I here affirm, which Divines,
 ' Canonists, and Civilians unanimously teach, which is prov'd
 ' by Reasons, and confirmed by Examples? And in his Exhortati-
 on to the *Irish* Catholicks, annexed as an Appendix to it, he
 presses them to renounce the Protestant Kings of *England*, and
 elect an *Irish* Native, that is a Catholick; and excites them also
 to put to death, not only the *English* and *Scotch* Hereticks in
Ireland, but even the Catholick *Irish* also, that should continue
 faithful to an Heretical King. This is downright Jesuitism in-
 deed, without equivocation, or mental reservation; but it was
 inconsistent even with the Oath of Association, which those in-
 famous Rebels had made, and was therefore condemned to be
 burnt by the Grandees of the Rebellion, who stiled themselves
 the supreme Council of the *Roman* Catholick Confederates in
Ireland; and yet this Libel was not only printed with allow-
 ance, but also industriously dispersed throughout *Ireland*, not
 without the knowledg of the Nuncio himself, as Father *Wells*
 insinuates, who also protected a Priest from Justice, in whose
 keeping it was found. And *Mahony* himself, who lived at St.
Roch in *Lisbon*, did openly declare, that he was the Author of it,
 which he durst not have done, had not his Book been approved,
 and had he not known his Doctrine to be conformable to the
 sentiments of his Superiors, to whom he was accountable for
 it. I will conclude what I have here said, to invalidate their
 appeals to this Decree of their General, as a testimony how far
 they are from asserting the deposing decree, with what one of
 their own Religion, who thinks it was intended to oblige in
France only, has affirmed concerning it: I * have (says he) been * The Jesuits
 ' informed, that 'tis a known practice of your Society, that your Reasons un-
 ' Generals should forbid some actions, which they are not un- reasonable,
 ' willing their subjects should practice, to the end that they may P. 69.
 ' reject weak men, by saying, it cannot be true, because they
 ' have a rule against it; and to more understanding parties they
 ' may excuse the fault, by laying the defect on particulars, who
 ' will not obey their commands. And thus have I at large con-
 sidered the most important pleas of *Anti-Cotton's* Answerers to the
 charge of teaching the lawfulness of deposing and murdering
 Princes. I proceed now to some other particular Doctrines here
 O 2 imputed

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

imputed to them, which usually follow in the Retinue of the former; were designed for its service, and exactly fitted for the more easie and convenient execution of it. And these are the exemption of the Clergy, their Doctrines of Equivocation, Confession, and blind obedience.

1. I begin with their exempting all Religious Persons from the Secular Jurisdiction; how effectually this Prerogative tends to the Advancement of the Papal See, the Establishment of an Ecclesiastick Tyranny, the Ruin of Civil Government, and the facilitating all Designs against the Persons and Crowns of Princes, is obvious and manifest to all Men. The *Romish* Clergy had for several Ages claimed this exorbitant Priviledg, and 'twas the safest way to Canonization, to dye in the Defence of it. That Passage of the *Psalmist*, *Touch not mine anointed*, the command of honouring our Fathers; and those Words of our Saviour's, *The Children are free*; were urged as a good Foundation for it in Scripture; and then they could at their pleasure make Canons and Decrees to confirm it; and sometimes also they got the Concurrence of the Civil Power to enact it into a Law; but there were always some, even of the Clergy, honest enough to oppose it; in the Civil Law, Constitutions were made against it; in this Kingdom, Statutes are enacted to suppress it; and notwithstanding the Canons, the Convening of Clerks before Secular Judges, was always practiced. But when the Tyranny of the Clergy began to be shook off at the Reformation, and it was clearly seen, that these Immunities had no other Foundation, but in their own Decrees; then divers, even of those States that retained their Religion, did freely oppose them, and a great part of their own Clergy disowned and renounced them; but however, they were Jewels of too great a Value to be easily parted with, and therefore they were still maintained to the least Punctilio, by those, who were most devoted to the Interests of the Court of Rome: among these, the Jesuits have been always the Men, that have carried them to the greatest height, and have not been contented with many others of their Church, to found them upon Civil and Ecclesiastical Sanctions; but have asserted a *jus Divinum* for them, and so have made this Exemption of the Clergy, to be very near a kin to an Article of Faith, and almost downright Here-
sy

fy to deny it. *Bellarmin* and *Suarez*, the two greatest Men of their Order, have been also the stiffest Advocates of these Immunities; the former, at large, asserts them in his Book *de Clericis*, cited by *Anti-Cotton*, and in those Tracts which he wrote against *Barclay*, and the Apology of King *James*, and in * Defence of the Popes Cause against the *Venetians*; the latter spends a whole Book in his Defence of the Catholick Faith, in discussing the Controversy about them; in handling whereof, † he lays down this Conclusion, as certain and indubitable, That Clerks are exempted from the Civil Power, both by Divine and Humane Right, † in all litigious Causes, at least in which they are Defendants, and ∴ absolutely in all Criminal Causes whatsoever; and he adds, That those Laws in *Justinian*, which ordained that Clergy-men should be tried for Civil Crimes before Secular Tribunals, were null in themselves, because against the Laws of God and the Church. He † affirms also, That they are not bound to obey Civil Laws, *Vi Jurisdictionis*, but only (as 'tis probable) *Vi Rationis*, that is, they are bound to obey only when they think fit; which he says, is also *Bellarmin's* Opinion; And in short, that Secular Laws have neither Directive nor Co-active Power over Clergy-Men; agreeably to which, he lays down this Resolution, also, that their Goods and † Estates, as well Patrimonial and Temporal, as Ecclesiastical, are exempted from all Laws of Tribute and Taxation. And lastly †, all these Privileges he extends to all their inferior Orders, such as Readers, Door-keepers, *Acolytes*, as well as to the Superior Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Many other Authors of the Society might be added; but these I have alledged, may be presumed to speak the minds of all their Order, since it is one of their Constitutions, that there be no deformity of Doctrines among them, but that they all speak the same things, be of one Mind, of one Judgment. But if this Argument, which has been so much urged of late, have any force in it, That Kings have by the Laws of God and Nature, a right to the Service of all their Subjects; and that therefore, all Laws that debar them of this Right, are null in themselves; I hope, it may be allowed to draw these Inferences from it; That then that Church has grievously erred, that has made Canons and Degrees contrary to the

* Def. fidei, lib. 4.

† Cap. 9.

† Cap. 14.

∴ Cap. 15.

† Cap. 16.

† Cap. 24.

† Cap. 10.] 3

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

the Laws of God and Nature, to exempt those who were born Subjects to Princes, not only from serving them in some Offices of Trust, but also from all manner of Subjection and Obedience to them; and that the Defenders of such Decrees are not so tender of the Prerogative of Kings, as they would have it thought; but that they who will not allow Protestants for the Preservation of their Religion, to lay any Restrictions upon Subjects; may yet allow it lawful for the advancement of the Papal Power, to exempt many thousands of them from the Jurisdiction of Civil Magistrates. How pernicious this Principle is to Civil Government, and what horrid Consequences do naturally follow from it, is observed by *Anti-Cotton*. If it be once allowed, That Kings and States have no Jurisdiction over Church-men, then it follows, that they are not their Subjects; that as such, they are not under any Obligation of Fidelity to them; That when their Superiors command, they may attempt any thing against them, as a Subject commissioned by his Prince may fight against a foreign King; and that, lastly, whatever they attempt, they are not guilty of Treason against their King, nor can be punished as Traytors for it. This is nothing but the natural Result of exempting Clerks from Subjection to Princes; and what *Em. Sa.* thought fit to make an Aphorism, as *Antic. urget.* And let it be considered, what *Eudamon* Answers to it, 1. He would insinuate, that there was no such thing in that Author, because he could not find it in the Edition at *Rome*; but the Apologist confesses, that the Author had those Words; but in a second Edition, they were expunged; and why, I shall not stay to enquire. But 2. he endeavours to solve all by this honest Distinction, between two Classes of People in every Government: The 1st of those, who are Members of the Body Politick, or being not Members of it, are yet in Subjection to the Government, as soon as they enter into the Bounds of it: and these are the only Persons that can be guilty of Treason against it. For 2^{dly}, there are others, who are not properly subject, but are yet under the Protection of the Government, and enjoy the Benefit of it: and are therefore, obliged in point of Gratitude, and by the Law of Charity, to assist and defend it: Then he affirms, that the Ecclesiastics are only under this latter Obligation, and so concludes,

* That

* That 'tis most certain, that the right of Subjection cannot be violated by those, who are not Subjects, and therefore they cannot (to speak properly) be guilty of Treason. The Result then is, That according to the Jesuits, Church-men are no Subjects to Civil Magistrates; That they are bound in Charity to live Peaceably under them; but if they Rebel, and endeavour to Depose and Murder Princes, 'tis ingratelully and uncharitably done, but they are not therefore guilty of Treason; neither have the Civil Magistrates power to Judge, Condemn, or Punish them for it.

* Certissimum est ius Subjectionis ab eo non Violari qui Subjectus non est, quare ne proprie quidem Majestatem ab eo lædi. p. 100.

2dly. The next thing we are to consider, is the Doctrine of Equivocation, which our Author has charged upon them, wherein he first gives an account of the Equivocations of Garnet, in his Depositions about the Gunpowder-Conspiracy. By Virtue of this juggling Doctrine, this worthy Provincial, and Martyr for Treason, defended his own and his friends Perjuries, at his Arraignment, before all the World; and owned, that he had seen and allowed a Treatise Written purposely to maintain it. To this *Eudæmon* answers, That *Garnet* was not the Author of this Treatise. But however he owns, that such a Book was Written; which the Apologist peremptorily denies; tho the Book was then publicly known here in *England*, seen, and perused by many, and \therefore was taken notice of by Forreigners; and is still to be seen among the Bodly MSS. in which MSS. *Garnet* with his own Hand dashed out the first Title, *A Treatise of Equivocation*, and Substituted in its room, *A Treatise against Lying and Fraudulent Dissimulation*; and in the Close of it, there is an Approbation of *Blackwell*, Arch-Priest of *England*, and Apostolical Protonotary; wherein he commends it, as a Treatise very Learned, and truly Pious and Catholick, wherein the Lawfulness of Equivocation is Proved by Scriptures, Fathers, Doctors, Schoolmen, Canonists, and Reasons. This Art of Equivocation had before that been Zealously Taught and Defended by the Famous Jesuit *Parsons*, in his *Treatise of Mitigation*, Answered by Dr. *Morton*: So that it was then become a Famous Controversie, and the Jesuits were not ashamed to Write Books in Defence of so Lewd a Doctrine; which (as times were then) was very convenient

\therefore Hospinian. 228, 229.
 || Foulis. 700.
 A Treatise of Equivocation.

* E. 45. Laud. The design of it is to prove, that a Catholick or any other person being demanded upon his Oath, whether a Priest were in such a place, may (notwithstanding his perfect knowledge to the contrary) without Perjury, and securely in Conscience, answer No; with this secret meaning reserved in his mind, that he was not there, so as that any man is bound to detect it. p. 1.

convenient for them. But further, our * Author has shewed, how this Doctrine of Equivocation was avowed also by *Andrew Eudæmon*, in his Apology for *Garner*; and here *Eudæmon* Triumphs mightily, as if he had detected a manifest Forgery in him, because in his quotation he puts *Judiciis*, instead of *Indiciis*, and draws this Inference from

thence, That *Eudæmon* there files the Justice of the Kings of England, exercised upon the Jesuits, an unjust Jurisdiction. But must this be nothing else but downright Forgery? Does not the Similitude of the Letter prove it to be only an easy and innocent mistake? And granting that Inference not to follow from *Eudæmon*'s Words, yet what wrong has he done the Jesuits in it? For do they not all maintain, That Clerks are exempt from secular Jurisdiction? And does it not thence follow, that such Jurisdiction when it is assumed, is unjust? But let us see what our Answerers say to the Doctrine it self, that is charged upon them; ¶ *Eudæmon* thus resolves the case, That if a Lawful Judge proceed according to a due form of Law, the Criminal is bound to answer truly at the peril of his Life; but if not, then all allow it, says he, Lawful peremptorily to deny the Truth, with the old Mental Reservation, *Ita ut teneam Dicere*, that is, as far as I am bound to discover it. The † Apologist reduces the opinion of their Divines in this matter, to these three heads.

¶ P. 108.

† P. 55.

1. That both Ecclesiastics and Laicks, when they are juridically Examined, are bound to Answer without Equivocation.
2. That this Equivocation is never to be used, but in a case of necessity.
3. That when any one is Interrogated by those who have no Jurisdiction over him, or do not proceed according to Law against him, he may then Lawfully Equivocate. This is fair and ingenuous, and so there is no colour for complaints of being Misrepresented in this point.

Another passage, Cited to this purpose, by our Author, is, That

That out of † *Sylveſter*, before urg-
ed by *Eudemon*, in his Apology
for *Garnet*, and in this Answer, a-
gain approved and commended by
him. * This paſſage ſeems to com-
prehend the whole Doctrin of E-
quivocating before Judges in its ut-
moſt latitude; and I ſhall take liber-
ty to make theſe Reflections on it.

1. That all Eccleſiaſticks are
hereby allow'd to Equivocate be-
fore a Civil Judg, becauſe they are
not *Simpliciter Subditi*.

2. That any other Criminal has the ſame Li-
cenſe, if he
can find any flaw in the Proceedings; nay, if he only thinks or
doubts, that they are not juridical, (ſo ſays || *Leſſius* Ex-
preſſy.

3. That if a Judg be not Legal, or acts Illegally, 'tis at
worſt but a venial ſin to lye before him; And

4. That if a Man be not a Blockhead, he may avoid com-
mitting even a venial ſin alſo, by Answering cunningly, and
ſophiſtically, and handſomly impoſing upon his Judg, by words
of an ambiguous and double Sence. How Deſtructive ſuch
Poſitions are to all Civil Juſtice and Government, and how
directly they tend to Legitimate Perjury, and to ſuperſede
the uſe of all Oaths and Examinations in Courts of Judica-
ture, let every one judg. 'Tis true, the preſent Pope *Innocent*
the 11th, has Condemned all ſuch Equivocations and Mental
Reſervations, in ſwearing, as at leaſt Scandalous and Pernici-
ous in Practice. But how it can be ſcandalous or pernicious
to practice a Doctrin Authoriſed by Popes, and Fathers, and
Doctors, and Recommended by the Examples of Holy Men
in Scripture, and even of our Saviour himſelf in the Goſpel,
(for all theſe the Jeſuits alledg for themſelves) I leave to
the Defenders of Papal Infallibility to conſider. But how little
Account has been made of that Decree, wherein this Doctrin
of Equivocation is Condemned, the World has been lately
informed. And it is not likely, that the Jeſuits, who aſſume a
kind of Infallibility to themſelves, and never Recant what

† In verbo Accuſatio. Not in the fifth
Accuſation. For Antic. miſtook v. for 5.

* Quando judex judicè non procedit,
vel quia accuſatus non eſt ei ſubditus ſim-
plicitèr, vel in hoc caſu, aut quacunque alià
de cauſa, tum licet mendacium eſt illicitum,
non tamen eſt mortale, quia non eſt contra
debitum juſtitia, nec in judicio vero, ſed
in uſurpato; imò non erit etiam veniale, ſi
reſpondendo cauteloſe aut ſophiſticè di-
cant aliquid falſum apud ſenſum judicis, &
apud ſuum verum.

|| De jure &
Juſtitià lib. 2.
cap 31. Deb. 3.
R. 10.

|| Miſſionaries
Arts. Preface.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

they have once Asserted, should have so much respect to the Decree of a Pope, acted with prejudices against their Order, and not designing *Ex Cathedrâ*, as to renounce either the belief or practice of a Doctrine, which the greatest men of their Order (such as Carninal *Tôlet, Valentia, Lessius, Vasques, and Suarez*.) have unanimously taught and defended. And indeed, as they have contrived this Doctrine, 'tis impossible for them to give any assurance, tho they should make all possible Protestations of their Sincerity, in the clearest words imaginable, that they did yet heartily and sincerely renounce it: for there are no expressions so clear, as not to be capable of being Equivocally understood, or of not losing their Genuine

Sense, when Mental Reservations are added to them. † And so much one of their own Casuists has expressly affirmed, *That 'tis lawful to use Equivocation, even when we are required to answer without it.* And so again, *Whatsoever the Judge urges, who interrogates unjustly, so far, as even to make the Examined Swear, That he doth not make use of Equivocation; yet still he may Equivocate in his Answer, understanding secretly, that he does it, as far as he is oblig-*

ed to Swear clearly, or by forming some other thoughts, which may make his answer true.

3ly, Another Doctrine, which this Holy Order has Zealously maintained as an Appendix to that of Deposing and Killing Kings, is the inviolable secrecy of Auricular Confession. Our Author has given us a Specimen of what had been asserted concerning it by *Eudæmon* in his Apology for Garnet, and *Sanchez* in his Disputation about it; this last Author there affirms, That the Seal of Confession is not to be violated for the preservation of a whole Kingdom. But this is Humble and Modest in comparison of the transports of another † Zealot of the Order, who boldly resolves, *That what is discovered under the Seal of Confession, is not to be revealed, for any cause whatsoever; tho it were the Salvation of all the race of Mankind, tho it were to prevent*

† Sanchez. op. Mor. in præcepta Decalogi, lib. 3. C. 6. N. 45. Tandem id observandum est, quoties licitum est ad se tuendum uti æquivocatione, id quoque erit licitum, etsi interrogans urgeat excludens illam Æquivocationem; — Censeo quantumcunque reduplicet iniquus interrogator, ut juret se nullâ Æquivocatione uti, & absque omni pporus Æquivocatione id intelligere, adhuc id jurare potest, intelligendo ita ut planè debeat loqui & explicare; vel aliquid aliud mente concipiendo, quo verum id reddatur.

† Henriquez. 2. sum. Theol. Mor de pœnit. lib 3. c. 19. n. 5.

prevent the destruction of the Innocent, an Universal Conflagration of the world, or the ruine and overthrow of all Religion in it. And yet there was another Jesuit in France, that said a bolder thing than this (and 'tis King James that Relates it). That if our Lord Jesus Christ was living upon Earth, passible and Subject to Death, and one had revealed to the same Jesuit, that he intended to kill Jesus Christ; rather then Reveal the Confession, he would suffer Jesus Christ to be slain. One would think that the Jesuits held nothing Sacred but Confession, and that they esteemed it to be the Sum of all the Law, and the Prophets, and of the Gospel it self. But this is their great Diana, and 'tis the interest of all the Craftsmen to stickle for her.

A passage parallel to these, is related by *Anti-Cotton*, being an Account of what was declared to *Casaubon*, by *Fronto* the Jesuit, concerning Confession; and here the Apologist with great triumph produces part of a Letter from *Casaubon*, wherein he absolutely disowns, That he had any Discourse with *Fronto* about it: But *Casaubon* in the same Epistle averred, That the Jesuit *Binet* maintained to him in the Kings Library, That it was better all Kings should be Killed, than one Confession revealed, *Fronto* being also then in the Library, but not hearing the Discourse: So that the substance of what *Anti-Cotton* relates, is undoubtedly true; 'tis clear, such a Doctrine was maintained by a Jesuit; and all that can be made of this mistake of *Anti-Cotton* is, That he was not exactly informed of all the Circumstances of the Story; had the Apologist therefore inserted the whole Letter, it would have cleared the matter; but he thought fit to suppress what was not for his advantage, and *Casaubon* had reason to reflect on his Candor and Honesty for it. Our Author has sufficiently exposed the impiety of this Doctrine, and shewed, how dangerous it is to Government, how contrary to the Laws of God and Nature, how it tends to incite men unto Treason, and implies an approbation of it. To this *Eudæmon* replies, That meerly to conceal Treason, is not to encourage or approve it. But the Laws of all Nations, and the common Sense of all men do so interpret it, and the concealers of Treason have been ever reputed and punished as consenters and promoters of it. He urges also (as the other Defenders of this Doctrine usual-

|| *Casaub. Ep. ad Frontonem*
Ducæum. p.
140.

|| *Ibid. 142.*

ly do) that the discovery of such secrets in Confession is for the safety of Kings; for the Priest, if he discharge his duty, will dissuade the Conspirator from his design; but then the Confessor must not be a Jesuit, for such a one (if he acts consequently to his principles) will sometimes encourage the fact, as glorious in it self, beneficial to the Church, and meritorious in the person that attempts it.

The same *Eudæmon* denies what *Antic.* affirms, that 'tis the opinion of the *Sorbon*, that Treason revealed in Confession ought to be discovered; but it is evident from * *Thuanus*, that this was at that time generally believed to be the Doctrine of that Faculty, and that so it was presumed by the Parliament of *Paris*. But further, he cites *Suarez*, affirming the contrary to be the opinion of all the Divines and Canonists, except *Alrisfordensis*; and adds, that the chief foundation of their opinion is the common consent and universal tradition of the Church. This Universal tradition is the great Topick by which they prove all their Doctrines; and a Jesuit scorns to make the least abatement of his pretences to it, when he is proving any thing; especially when the power of the Pope, the Dignities and Immunities of Churchmen, the Inexhaustible Mine of Confession, or any of their other wealthy Doctrines are concerned, then to be sure, Universal tradition, the authority of the Church, the Decrees of Councils, and all the Canonists and Divines, must be all pressed to serve them.

All the Divines (says * *Suarez*) excepting one, do agree, that the seal of Confession is for no cause to be broken; but he had forgot the resolution of the irrefragable Dr. † *Alexander de Ales* in this point; *That if a person confess a crime he resolves to commit, and will not be dissuaded from it, then the Priest is not bound to conceal it; that he ought not indeed to reveal it, unless some great inconveniency be likely to ensue, but in such a case 'tis no breach of his duty; nay, he is bound to reveal it.* And he gives this reason for it, *That the Priest in confession stands in the room of God, to reconcile sinners to him; but all reconciliation is for sins already committed, not such as are designed to be committed hereafter: whence it follows, that the Priest is not appointed by God to receive*

* Hist. Cont.
p. 219.

* *Suarez* Tom.
4. Disp. 33.
Sec. 1.
† *Alex. de*
Ales. Venice.
pars 4ta, Q.
19. Artic. 2. in
resol. Poteſt
quis confiteri
peccatum, ut
eſt in propo-
ſito de futu-
ro, in hoc caſu
non tenetur
celare ſimpli-
citer, nec ſi
ſacerdos talem confeſſionem revelaret, poſſet condemnari, tanquam violator
ſigilli confeſſionis.

*Sacerdos talem confeſſionem revelaret, poſſet condemnari, tanquam violator
ſigilli confeſſionis.*

the confession of future sins, and therefore is not bound to conceal them. To the same purpose many others might be added, but this testimony of *Alensis* may suffice to shew, that the Divines are not so unanimous in this point, as that Jesuit in the height of his confidence affirms.

If any one has the curiosity to know the grounds upon which this obligation to secrecy, even in cases of Treason is, they are briefly such as these; † *Valentia* founds it upon the natural precepts of fidelity, justice, and charity, which forbid the publishing any secret committed to us, to the prejudice of our neighbour; upon the Laws of the Church, which enjoyn inviolable secrecy; and upon those Divine Laws, which enjoyn Sacramental Confession, and are therefore supposed to enjoyn whatsoever is requisite to encourage the practice of it, which (they say) a security, that what is confessed shall not be discovered, is, because were there no such security, it would hinder and discourage men from the use of confession. *Suarez* rejects all other reasons as insufficient, and acquiesces in this last alone. *Vasquez* thinks nothing will suffice but a positive divine precept, yet produces none. *Aquinas* grounds it upon a meer congruity, that the Priest represents God in receiving Confessions, but God does not discover what is confessed to him, and therefore it is not fitting the Priest should do it. Others ground it chiefly upon the publick faith, which the Church gives unto all Penitents that come to Confession. And lastly, some have assigned this reason, why a design against the life of a King, revealed in confession should not be discovered, That the institution of Kings was of humane right, but Confession was of divine right.

These are the sandy foundations upon which they have built this monstrous opinion; and they serve only to discover what a mean opinion the defenders of it have of the great evils of Treason and Rebellion, and of the horrid impiety of murdering the Ministers and Vicegerents of God upon earth. Did they believe that to conceal Treason, was a thing evil in its self, by the Laws of God and Nature; that it was the highest degree of infidelity, injustice, and uncharitableness to betray Kings, and not to prevent the ruin and destruction of whole Kingdoms when it is in their power, they would never make
that

† Tom. 4. Disp.
7. Q. 13. p. 1.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

that which they esteem an Ordinance of God, a bond of iniquity ; and turn the Institution of Christ into a Sacrament of Rebellion. It is a rule which themselves teach as certain in Divinity, That all compacts, promises, and oaths which oblige us to any thing in its self unlawful, are void ; and thence it follows, That granting Confession to imply a compact of Secrecy, it cannot be extended to any thing unlawful to be concealed, or which we are antecedently obliged to discover. Now the Laws of God do manifestly oblige us to do all we lawfully can, for the Preservation of our King and Country ; and therefore also, to reveal Treason discovered in Confession, unless some plain and evident Law of God do forbid it ; for Implications, and remote Inferences, are not sufficient to supercede the Obligation of plain and evident Duties ; and to argue, that he who commands Confession of Sins, does forbid the discovery of Crimes designed to be committed, is a consequence as absurd, as can well be imagined. Suppose that the discovery of such Crimes should accidentally hinder some wicked Persons among them from confessing their Sins, must a known Duty be therefore omitted, because it may be accidentally the occasion of Sin to another ? Or, must I by a pernicious Silence suffer a whole Kingdom to be ruined, for fear of discouraging Villains to confess Crimes, of which they shew no Repentance, but still design to commit, even when they confess them ? And therefore, according to their own Doctrine, are not sacramentally confessed, and consequently, have no right to the Seal of Sacramental Confession.

One thing clearly discovereth the wickedness of these abominable Casuists : for tho they scruple the lawfulness of revealing unrepented Treason ; nay, esteem it a Crime greater than Sacriledg it self ; yet they make no scruple in the Defence of this Arbitrary Doctrine, to teach the lawfulness of as plain and downright Perjury, as can be committed ; they unanimously teach with *Valentia*, That if a Magistrate upon Oath, require a Priest to declare what was revealed to him in Confession, he may flatly and plainly deny it ; understanding that he did not so bear it, as to tell it, or forming some other Equivocation in his Mind ;
for

for (say they) he is not bound to * answer directly to the design of the Question; but may delude him that Interrogates, by telling him some other impertinent Truth, which he may either express in ambiguous Words, or solve by a mental Reservation. But if this be not plain and evident Perjury, there can be certainly no such thing in the World; for to give false Testimony after a solemn Oath to declare the Truth, is precise Perjury in the Sense of all Men; now, that which is reserved in the Mind, is no part of the Testimony, and therefore cannot make it true, nor consequently save him from swearing falsely, and so contracting the horrible Guilt of Perjury upon his Soul.

4thly, The last Doctrine, which I shall here consider, is, That of blind Obedience, which Ignatius, the Founder of their Order, has at large enjoyned them in his Constitutions, and recommended to them in a long Epistle to his *Portugal* Brethren, and the substance of what he enjoyns them is this. 1. As to the matter of the Superiors command, they must obey, not only in things Obligatory, but in other things indefinitely. 2. As to the manner of Execution, they must perform what is commanded, intirely, readily, strenuously, and with the greatest Expedition; so that if they chance to be writing when they receive a command, they must not finish a single Letter they have begun, but in that very instant go about the performance of it. 3. As to the Dispositions of their Minds, they must not have the least repugnance in their Wills or Understandings, to the thing commanded, but the Will and Judgment of the Superior must be the Rule of theirs, which they must blindly follow without any Disquisition of it, and perswade themselves that all things are just and lawful, which are commanded by him. Nay, they must perfectly deny their own Wills and Judgments, and only Act by those of their Superiors. And lastly, be as Carcasses and Staves in their Hands, which having no Sense or Motion of their own, may be mov'd and manag'd as they please. And 4. as to the Person

* *Valentia Tom*, 4. Disp. 7. Qu. 13. punc.
4. Potest Confessor jurare se nescire, intelligendo semper *ut dicat*, aut aliquam aliam similem Amphibologiam, mente concipiendo; non enim teneris responsonem ullo modo conformare ad formam interrogationis, intentionemque interrogantis, quin omnino potes illum deludere, dicendo aliam impertinentem veritatem, quam vel Amphibologicis per se Verbis explices, vel partim verbis exprimas, partim mente concipias.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

Person of their Superior, they must not look upon him as a Man obnoxious to Error and Misery, but they must regard him, as if he were Jesus Christ, or God himself, in whom resides infinite Wisdom and Goodness, and who will supply the want of Understanding or Honesty, or whatsoever else is defective in them. These are the Rules and Measures of that blind Obedience, which is the peculiar Characteristick of this Society, and which the World was never acquainted with before these last days, in which (if I may be permitted to transcribe the Blasphemy of *Pedro Deza*) God has spoken to us by his Son *Ignatius*, whom he hath appointed Heir of all things. *Anti-Cotton* has plainly shew'd the Design and Tendency of this prodigious Doctrine, that it is the Source and Spring of all their Contrivances and Attempts against the Civil Powers; that it is calculated to facilitate the Execution of the most bloody Designs: And that hereby any Jesuit, if he be commanded to Assassinate any Man, is bound instantly to put it in Execution, without so much as casting an Eye upon the Unlawfulness, the Danger, or Difficulty of it.

Eudemon in his Answer to this Charge, alledges two things, which must be considered; 1. That it is not true, that the Jesuits are obliged by Vow to this blind Obedience, but that it is recommended to them only as a matter of Council and Perfection.

But 1. the very words of their 11 Vow, seem plainly to comprehend this blind Obedience in them; for after their vowing *Poverty, Chastity, and perpetual Obedience in the Society of Jesus*, it follows, *And I promise that I will enter into the same Society, to live perpetually in it, understanding all things according to the Constitutions of it.* Now *Suarez* proves

that this last Clause, notwithstanding the word Promise before it, is yet a part of the Vow: And therefore blind Obedience being enjoyn'd in those Constitutions, it seems evident that no other Obedience can be understood in this Vow, because those Constitutions are the Rule by which all are to be interpreted in it. Yet 2dly, because the same † Author affirms, that blind Obedience

¶ *Hospinian Historia Jesu. p. 37.* Voveo coram Sacratissima Virgine Maria, & curia tua cœlesti Univerſa Divinæ Majestati tuæ paupertatem Caſtatem & Obedientiam perpetuam in Societate Jeſu, & promitto eandem Societatem me ingreſſurum, ut Vitam in eo perpetuo degam, omnia intelligendo juxta ipſius Societatis Conſtitutiones.

† *Suarez Tom. 4. de religione lib. 4. ch. 12. Sect. 10.*

Obedience is not rigorously a part of their Vow, but only recommended *sub consilio*. Let this be granted them, still it is prescrib'd as a Virtue of great Merit and Perfection, and this is incitement enough to a Jesuit, blindly to execute what command soever his Superior enjoyns him. And 't's yet further here to be observed, that Suarez, discussing what precisely belongs to their Vow, lays down that Constitution of Ignatius, as his Foundation, *That the Superior has a right to command any thing that tends to the ends for which the Society was instituted, viz. The Good of their Neighbour, and the Glory of God.* And hence he infers, That those things which are necessary or convenient for the attaining those ends, are rightly comprehended in the matter of the Vow; whence it will follow, that the Jesuits are obliged, even by their Vow, to obey their General, when, for instance, he commands them to execute the Sentence of the Pope against any Prince; because it is a part of their Faith, that the Pope has a judicial Power over Princes, which he is to make use of for the Glory of God, and the good of Souls: And whatever is necessary or expedient for those ends, is contained under the precise matter of the Vow, and may therefore lawfully be commanded, and must by them be necessarily obeyed. 2dly, *Anti-Cotton's Answerers Reply*, that 'tis false, that this blind Obedience is recommended without any Limitation, because it is thus qualified in their Constitutions, *That they must obey in all things, which are not discern'd to be sinful.* And in Ignatius's Epistles, *In all things in which there is no manifest Sin.* But how far this miserable Shift is from justifying the Impiety of this stupid Obedience, will appear from these two Considerations.

1. That this Exception of discerning sin in the thing commanded, can signifie nothing to those, who are supposed to be \ddagger *Regula Soc. Jes. Lugduni.* blind, and must not use their own Judgment in discerning any thing. How can a blind Man see? Or he, who has intirely *Const. 31. Co-* renunc'ed interi-
us resignationem & veram abnegationem propriæ voluntatis & judicii habere. 35. Omnia
justa esse vobis persuadendo, omnem Sententiam ac judicium vestrum cæca quadam Obe-
dientia abnegando. 36. Sinere debent perinde ac si cadaver essent aut senis baculus. Ig-
natii Ep. ad ea facienda quæcunque superior dixerit cæco quodam impetu voluntatis pa-
rendi cupidæ sine ulla prorsus Disquisitione seramini. Superioris vocem ac justa non secus
ac Christi vocem excipite.

Q

renounc'd

* Ibid. c. 15.
Sect. 27.

renounc'd all use of his own Understanding, understand the sinfulness of any thing propounded to him? Can a Stick, or a Carcase perform the Actions of Sense and Reason? Or is it to be imagin'd that one, who receives the command of his Superior, as the Voice of Christ, and thinks it an Impiety to sift and examine it, should be capable of suspecting and discerning the unlawfulness of it? * *Suarez* himself acknowledges this to be the property of blind obedience, That the prudential judgment directing it, is founded on the Superiors judgment, and that as a blind man is lead by another man, and sees by another's eyes, so is the subject to be manag'd by his Superior. And is it not absurd then, after all this, to put in Cautions about discerning the sinfulness of the Superior's command? 'tis just as if a man after he had put out a traveller's eyes, should command him to follow him whithersoever he should lead him, unless he should see a precipice before him; for 'tis, I think, as difficult for a man that has renounc'd his understanding, to discern sin, as 'tis for a blind man to see a precipice.

* Ibid. c. 15.
Sect. 21.

2. Granting that this limitation may signifie something, yet it cannot be apply'd to the case before us; I mean it cannot secure the lives of Princes, should their Superiors command the Jesuits to destroy them. For it is their Doctrine (as * *Suarez* delivers it at large) that be there never so great a degree of probability that the thing commanded by the Superior be unlawful; yet the authority of the Superior ought in practice to outweigh it; and that therefore nothing can discharge the subject from his duty of obedience, but only the greatest certainty (that men are capable of in practical and moral matters) that the thing is intrinsically evil, and not so only by positive Laws. And yet further, to make all sure at last, he affirms, That if the person commanding be a learned, prudent, and religious person, tho the judgment of the subject was before the command morally certain of the lawfulness, yet the command of a person so qualified, *does † destroy that moral certainty, and makes the thing probably lawful, and then the obligation to obedience does again take place.* Hence it follows, that since the Doctrine of the Pope's power of deposing Princes has been taught and approved by a great number of those who have been esteemed the most prudent, learned, and religious Fathers of that Society,

† Ibid. Sect.
23. Tollit
consequenter
moralem cer-
titudinem
prioris judicii
& tunc locum
habet obedi-
entiae efficaci-
tas.

ty, and that not only as a probable Doctrine (tho even that would be sufficient) but as absolutely certain, and *de fide*; whenever the Pope or the General of their Order by Commission from him, shall command a Jesuit to stab any Prince he has condemn'd, his obligation to a blind obedience must according to this Hellish doctrine indispensibly bind him to do it. And such a command to one that has been educated in the belief of that deposing principle, will be so far from being suspected unlawful, that it must necessarily be look'd upon as highly meritorious. And therefore 'tis evident the exception of things manifestly sinful can signify nothing for the security of Princes against the practice of those, whose avowed principle it is that the deposition of them is so far from being a manifest sin, that it is a manifest duty.

I have now done with the Doctrines charged upon the Jesuits by *Anti-Cotton*. Upon the whole 'tis, I hope, undeniably evident, That the lawfulness of deposing and killing Kings, with all its train of other inferior doctrines subservient to it, have been justly imputed to this holy Society. I will not be afraid to affirm, That the existence of a Deity, the truth of a future judgment, or any other fundamental article of Religion, have not been more plainly taught and asserted by the writers of that Order, than the aforementioned doctrines. But yet 'tis their practice that is the most convincing proof of their doctrine, and the frequent attempts of their Instruments against the lives of Princes, the clearest demonstration of the guiltiness of their Principles. For these doctrines of theirs have not been maintained as meer Speculative truths, but have been frequently reduc'd to practice; were first written in the Books of Divines, and then in the blood of Kings. This therefore the Author of *Anti-Cotton* chose as the best method to convict the Jesuits, by proving first out of their Authors, that they approv'd the Parricide of Kings; and then shewing in several instances, that they actually fomented and promoted it. It remains therefore in the last place, to justify the truth of those several facts, which *Anti-Cotton* has charg'd upon the Jesuits, that so it may appear that their practice has been such as their doctrines; and that our Author has done them no injury in laying at their doors the murder of Kings, and destruction of Kingdoms.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

The Answerers (with a confidence essential to Jesuits) deny almost all the matters of fact, which our Author has advanc'd; and will not allow any one thing to be true which makes against them; but I shall spare my self the labour of examining every particular objection they urge. When the question is about Historical matters, all that is requisite to clear the truth of them; is only to produce the testimony of good Historians to confirm them, such proofs have been always thought sufficient; and the matters themselves are not capable of stronger. If therefore such Historical evidence can be brought for the passages contested, it must be acknowledg'd that all exceptions against them are of no force, and that there can be no reason to question the truth of them:

First then, I begin with the passages relating to *Garnet*, Provincial of the Jesuits, and the Gun-powder Conspiracy. The Answerers of *Anti-Cotton* (as all other writers of that time that have occasion to mention it) do freely own the truth of the Conspiracy it self; for that modern impudent forgery, that it was a Sham-plot of *Cecil's* contrivance, was not then thought of: But that which after *Bellarmin* they say in vindication of *Garnet* is, that he knew nothing of the design but what was reveal'd to him under the seal of Confession, and which he could not therefore discover; and they also peremptorily deny that any of the Jesuits were concerned in it. But to vindicate the truth of this matter, it is sufficient to appeal to the * authentick relation of the proceedings against the Conspirators, to the credit of which no reasonable objection can be made. There we find that *Garnet*, *Tesmond*, *Gerard*, and *Hall*, all Fathers of the Society, were not only conscious of the Villany, but also the encouragers of it; that they confirm'd the Conspirators in their design, by convincing them that it was lawful, nay meritorious; that they devis'd an Oath of Secrecy, and gave them the Sacrament to keep and retain them in that detestable Confederacy, and were all along the great agents and privy Counsellors of the Conspiracy. And as for *Garnet's* not knowing any thing of it but by Sacramental confession; the contrary was evidently proved at his Trial; and in effect plainly confessed by *Garnet* himself at his Execution: || *For when he had declar'd upon the Scaffold that he had only a general knowledg of the Plot by*
Catesby.

* Reprinted
by the Bishop
of Lincoln,
1679.

¶ Ibid. p. 225.

Catesby, but what he knew in particular was in Confession; he was put in mind by the Recorder, that the King had under his hand-writing these four Points among others:

1. That Greenway told him of it by way of Consultation.
2. That Catesby and Greenway came together to him to be resolved.

3. That Testimonie and he had conference in particular of the Powder-Treason in Essex long after.

4. Greenway had asked him who should be Protector? But Garnet said, That was to be referred till the Blow was past; these said he, prove your privacy, besides Confession, and these are extant under your own hand: Garnet answered, Whatsoever was under his hand, was true. And for that he disclosed not to his Majesty the things which he knew, he confessed himself justly Condemn'd, and for this did ask Forgiveness of his Majesty. There are many other convictive Evidences of the Guilt of that Miserable Man.

Casaubon in the aforementioned Epistle to Fronto Ducens, sets himself purposely to shew the falshood of what the Apologist and other Jesuits had alledg'd in his Vindication; and shews how deep he was in the Conspiracy, by demonstrative proofs out of the Original Writings, Tryals, and Letters of Garnet; which by the King's Order was delivered to him for that purpose. This might be further confirmed out of King James's Apology for the Oath of Allegiance: Bishop Andrews Tortura-Torti, and Abbot's Antilogion, in answer to Eudæmons Apology for Garnet; and lastly, out of the Historians of our own and other Nations. And if against such a cloud of Witneses; 'tis sufficient for Bellarmen, and after him Suarez, Eudæmon, and other Jesuits, to produce the single Testimony of one fugitive nameless Evidence, who was then in England, and after assured the Cardinal at Rome, that Garnet never confessed his Guilt, but denied it at his Death; I see not how it is possible to be assured of any matter of Fact, either past or present; But there is nothing so Evident but may be on such Testimony contradicted; and if what is contradicted must not be believ'd, we must become downright Sceptics, and believe nothing at all.

Osborns Mé-
moirs of K.
James. Sir R.
Baker, Thua-
nus, Mezeray.

The other matters of Fact related by Anti-Cotton, were Trans-

Transacted in France, and are most of them confirmed and delivered by the Historiographers of that Nation; especially *Thuanus*, a writer of unquestionable sincerity and veracity. I do not pretend that every minute particular related by this Author, is delivered also by those Historians; there are some passages which they might not take notice of, there are others which perhaps they durst not relate, because the times would not bear it. But that which I undertake to shew, is, That the most considerable passages, those that directly tend to verify the charge of King-killing against the Jesuits, are sufficiently asserted by them.

Thuanus, giving an account of the many Artifices that were

* *Accedente ad hoc sacri ordinis favore, & quorundam Religiosorum non segni Operâ, & Jesuitarum patrum imprimis, qui Fascinatam per scrupulosas in Arcanis Confessionibus quæstiones, plebem sensim a principis obsequio alienatam ad defectionem sollicitabant.* Tom. 3. lib. 75. p. 561. *Those words [Jesuitarum patrum imprimis] were in the Original Copy of Thuanus, but the Jesuits got them Expung'd, and therefore they are not in the common Edition. Vide Thuanum restitutum Amstelodami. Ann. 1663. p. 49.*

used to raise the Rebellion of the Holy League, tells us, * *That it was promoted by the Favour of the Clergy to it, and the great industry of certain Regulars, and especially of the Jesuits, who having possess'd the People by scrupulous questions in Auricular Confessions, and by degrees Alienated them from their Obedience to their Prince, Solicited them to open Rebellion.* The same is also affirm'd by † *Davila*, in his History of the Civil Wars of France, viz. *That the Jesuits were*

† Lib. 14. p. 661. *the first Authors and continual fomenters of the League. And Achilles de Harlay, the first President of the Parliament of Paris,*

*in that famous Oration which he made against the Restitution of the Jesuits, represents what great bigots they were for the Rebellion, and affirms the same thing with Anti-Cotton, † That the other Religious Orders were not universally Rebels, and that many of them constantly persever'd in their Loyalty to the King; but the Jesuits unanimously conspir'd against him, and there was not found one single Royalist in the whole Society. In the same place he affirms, That the Jesuits were the men that Animated the People to Rebel against Henry the 3d, and that they were not thought innocent in the Murder of him. * There were some that affirmed, That Jacques Clement had acquainted Father Comolet and other Jesuits with his design of Stabbing the King; But however that*

† *Thuan. Lib. 137. p. 1125.*

* *Foullis 547.*

that be, *Thuanus* assures us, That he was inclined to commit that prodigious Parricide by the Eloquent Declarations of the Preachers, and the Disputations of the Novices, the Divines, and most especially the Jesuits, who maintain'd it Lawful to kill a Tyrant. And when the Fact was committed, there were divers of their Order, that in their Writings Magnified it with the highest Encomiums, as a Magnanimous and Heroick Action; so that if encouraging and exciting Assassins to attempt such a Murder before it was perform'd, and approving and commending it after, are enough to make any one an accessory at least, 'tis evident that the Jesuits were not unconcern'd in it.

Thuanus Relatus p. 84.

His Successor *Henry 4th*, was all his Life long beleaguerr'd with Assassins † *Mezeray* tells us, That he had discovered above fifty Conspiracies against his Person, many of them contriv'd or fomented by Church-men, or some of the Religious Orders.

† *Mezeray*,
Translated by
John Bulteel,
p. 941.

Anno. 1593. One *Pierre Barriere* was engaged in a design to stab him. *Anti-Cotton* says, That *Varade* (the Rector of the Jesuits Colledge) was Conscious of this Detestable Attempt; but the Answerers flatly deny it. Yet ‖ *Davila*, *Mezeray*, and *Thuanus* do all Affirm, That he was Guilty of it. *Thuanus* gives a large account of the Conspiracy, and says, That this Villain came to *Paris*, and being brought to *Aubré Curat* of *S. Andre des Arcs*, was by him encouraged in his Resolution, and afterward to confirm him in it, carried to *Varade*, who rid him of all his Scruples, and Animated him to perform the Fact; and for that purpose took care, that he should be fortified with the Sacraments of Confession and the Eucharist; and so the Villain, being thoroughly instructed, buys him a Knife, and goes directly to *St. Dennis* (where the King then was) to Execute his Design. There he had an opportunity to give the Blow, but he felt something within him that restrain'd and disabled him; Thence he followed his Majesty to *Melun*, where upon Discovery of the Plot, he was Apprehended and Imprison'd: being Examind, he at last confessed all, and was executed. The Historian concludes his Relation of this Attempt, with this Digression. That upon this occasion the hatred of the Jesuits was renewed, as being the men that had not only been the first Trumpeters of the Rebellion; but were also said by their impious Sermons and their wicked Doctrines, to have exposed the sacred Persons

‖ History of
the Civil Wars
of France, p.
627. *Mezeray*,
838. *Thuanus*,
Lib. 107. p. 384.

Ibid. p. 335.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

Persons of Princes to promiscuous slaughter. Hereby they gave a most pernicious Example to others; and it was not long before the Divine Vengeance overtook them: For the Sixtus the 5th, had Excommunicated Navar and Conde, yet this he did rather out of necessity, because he was obliged to confirm the acts of his Predecessor, being over-reached by the Jesuits, than out of his own will and inclinations; and therefore afterwards he repented of it, and for that cause banished Claude Matthew, the Agent of the Holy League in Italy and Spain, to Loretto, where he perished in great misery. And another factious Demagogue in Paris, called Odo Piginus, a perfect Fury, who rag'd beyond all bounds in his turbulent Preachments, was at length punished with a real Phrenzy, and breath'd out his Soul in the midst of horrid Curses and dreadful Agonies.

The next employ'd to Assassinate the King, was John Chastel; And what our Author has related concerning him, tho deni'd also by the Answerers, may be justified by the same Authorities.

The three Historians just now mention'd, do all agree in making the Jesuits guilty of the Parricide. * In his Interrogatories, he confess'd that he was prompted to commit this Crime, because finding himself laden with heinous and unpardonable Sins, and imagining he could not avoid the Torments of Hell, he thought at least to diminish them by this attempt, which he believed to be a meritorious act; for that, said he, the King not being reconcil'd to the Church, could be nought but a Tyrant. Davila adds, † That he confess'd, and afterwards verified his Confession, That he was bred up in the Schools of the Jesuits, and had often heard it discoursed and disputed, that it was not only lawful, but also meritorious to kill Henry of Bourbon, a relapsed Heretick, and Persecutor of the Holy Church, who falsely appropriated to himself the Title of the K. of France. And to the same purpose, Thuanus ‡, who tells us also, That this Chastel, tho not above 19 years old, was guilty of monstrous and unnatural Vices, and yet was a Person of such esteem with the Jesuits, that they admitted him into their secret Conferences, and their exercises of Piety, as they call them. Mezerey § says, He confessed he had made his Exercises in the Colledge of Clermont under the Jesuits, and that they had often led him into a Chamber of Meditations, where Hell was represented with several most frightful Figures.

The

* Mezerey, 843.

† Ibid. l. 14. 661.

‡ Lib. 3. p. 517.

§ Ibid.

The Story of *Guignard*, as *Anti-Cotton* tells it, ^{p. —} is more largely related by * *Thuanus*. The *Apologist* seems unwilling to hear any more of him, and to confess him guilty. But *Eudemus* Apologizes for him; as *Richeome* had done before. That in his Papers he only discuss some Scholastical questions, and that *St. Thomas*, and the other Schoolmen might as well have been accused of Atheism for disputing about the Existence of a God, as this man of Treason: But the Schoolmen always confute the Objections they raise, and conclude the contrary. *Guignard* Dogmatically asserted his Treasonable positions, and peremptorily concluded, That the King must be murder'd. But the Parliament of *Paris* took no notice of these niceties; for *Guignard* having own'd his Libels, was condemn'd to be hanged, and the Jesuits had only the poor comfort of making a Problematical Martyr of him.

* *Ibid.* 520.
p. 10, 11.

† The Parliament upon this business of *Chastel* and *Guignard* ‡ *Mezeray*, p. 843. and *Davila*, p. 661. called to mind all the old Villanies of the Jesuits; it was remembered that they had been the Authors of the Rebellion; that they had manifested great zeal for the Interest of Spain, and were all along the corrupters of Youth, and the Preachers of Sedition. The Treasonable Speeches of Father *Alexander Haye*, a *Scotchman*, mentioned by *Anti-Cotton*, were prov'd; as also of Father *Gnewet*, Master in Philosophy, and the Ordinary Confessor of *Chastel*: Wherefore the Parliament after many debates, resolv'd to involve the whole Society in the punishment of these crimes: By a solemn Decree they condemn'd *Chastel* to suffer the pains accusom'd for the like Parricides; and did likewise ordain that the Priests and Students of the Colledge of *Clermont*, and others calling themselves of the Society of *Jesum*, as being corrupters of youth, disturbers of the common peace, and enemies to the King and State, should in three days leave the House and Colledge, and in fifteen the whole Kingdom; and that what belonged to them should be employed in pious uses, as the Parliament should dispose of it. In another Decree *Hayes* and *Gnewet* were condemn'd to perpetual banishment. After that, another Jesuit call'd *John le Belle*, was sentenc'd to make the honourable amends, to have his Goods confiscated, and be for ever banish'd. And then it was ordain'd that the house of *Chastel*, the Delinquent's Father, should be demolish'd, and a Pyramid in its place of carv'd

‡ *Thuanus*, *ibid.*
p. 519. *Mezeray*, *ibid.*

‡ *Thuan.* *ibid.*
p. 520.

Mezeray, *Ibid.*
vid. *Foulis*, p.
592.

stone erected, which should contain the cause of it. Upon one of the four Faces was the Decree engraven, and on the other three, divers *Latin* Inscriptions in Verse and Prose, in detestation of the memory of that horrid attempt; and that Doctrine of the Jesuits which was held to be the occasion of it.

Tkuanus. *ibid.*
p. 521. *Judicibus* qui causam compendinaverant succensens, subjecit hæc verba, ergo oportuit Jesuitas ex ore meo convinci?
Tkuan lib. 129
p. 1049.

It is evident that the King himself thought the Jesuits guilty, and approved the Decree that proscrib'd them. *Tkuanus* relates, That when the Princes and Nobles came to visit Him after he had been wounded in the month by *Chastel*, the King declared himself offended at the Judges, that had deferred giving Judgment against the Jesuits at the suit of the University of *Paris*; and added these words, *Was it then necessary that the Jesuits should be convicted by my own mouth?* And when Anno 1603. the King was resolv'd on their restitution, and had admitted *Armandus* the Provincial to speak for his Order in a long Harangue before him, even then he declar'd to them, *That what his Court of Parliament had decreed against them, they had not decreed it without good grounds, and mature deliberations.*

|| Pag. 907:

The Jesuits after their Banishment, never ceas'd by all imaginable Artifices, to solicit their Restitution. || *Mezeray* tells us, *They had great Intrigues at Court; they had very Potent Friends there, who urg'd that none but they were capable to instruct Youth, and convert the Hugonots; but their most prevalent Solicitor was William Fouquet la Varenne, Comptroller General of the Post-Offices, who from the meanest Employments of the King's House, had raised himself to the Cabinet by those Complaisances and Ministries, which are the most agreeable to the Great Ones.* It must be remembered that King was always engaged in amorous Intrigues, and had eleven Natural Children, besides those whom he would not, or could not well own; and then 'twill be easie to guess what kind of Ministries those were which raised *Varenne*. This dexterous Courtier was the man that prevailed with the King to restore the Jesuits, notwithstanding the earnest * Intercessions of the Parliament of *Paris*, who opposed the Edict of their reestablishment, and the convincing Reasons of † *Achilles de Harlay*, first President, against it. But the King being absolutely fixed in his resolution, the Parliament therefore were forced to verifie the Edict; and so at length it passed with a great many restrictions upon the Jesuits in it, which were never observed

Id. p. 543.

* *Thuan.* lib.
132. p. 1122.

† See his Oration at large,
Ibid. p. 1123.

served by them. And the year following, at the instance of Ra-
ther Cotton, the Pyramid was demolished on which the Decree
of their Banishment was Engraven. *Mexeray* makes these re-
marks upon it: To take away, says he, the brand-mark from the
forehead of the Society, they must pull down that Monument, which
taught men to curse that Hellish Parricide: It was desir'd it might
have been done by a Decree of Parliament; but when they found the
sentiments of that great Company were quite contrary, they did it
without further application to them: Tho not without giving the
world a just occasion to speak variously concerning it. In the place
of that Pyramid they made a Conduit or Fountain, all whose streams
of water tho clear and plentiful, shall never be able to wash away
the memory of so horrid a crime.

Anno 1610. that murder which was so often attempted, was
at length by that bloody Villain *Ravillac* effected. The Author
of *Anti-Cotton*, Chap. 3. has laid together a great many circum-
stantial proofs, which amount to at least a presumptive evidence,
that the Jesuits were not innocent in it. And what he has col-
lected, is not only for the most part confirmed in the French
Histories, but much stronger circumstances are added to height-
ten the suspicion of their guilt: As to the seditious Preaching
before the King's death, and the * Confession of *Ravillac* him-
self, that he was incited to this Villany by the Sermons of the
Preachers; what our Author has related, is sufficiently attested
by *Thuanus*. As to the reports which were given out of the
King's death, as a thing certain before it came to pass; I shall
here insert what *Mexeray* has delivered. † It is most certain, that
there were more than one single Conspiracy against this good King;
his enemies had forg'd so many, that it was very improbable, if not
impossible he should escape. They look'd upon his death as a thing so
certain in foreign Countries, that there came news of it from Spain
to France, that they published it in Milan almost a month before:
That several Merchants in the Low-Countries writing to their
Correspondents in Paris, desired to be inform'd whether the report
was true. And that the 8th of May, whereas he was killed the 14th,
a Courier passed through Liege, and bawled aloud, That he was
going to carry the news to the Princes of Germany: Was it, adds
he, that they thought to intimidate him therewith, and would im-
ploy their menaces before they would proceed to execution? ||

* Hist. Contin.
lib. 3. p. 78.
Quarentibus
nonnullis quid
ipsum ad hoc
facinus impu-
lisset, respon-
dit, conciones
quas audiui,
ex quibus di-
dici quare ne-
cessarium est
Regem e me-
dio tolli.

† Pag. 940.
|| See what is
cited by *Fou-
lis*, p. 642. out
of the History
of Henry le
Grand, by
*Hardevin de
Perefix* A.B.
of Paris, p.

This is also related by Foulis out of the Memoirs of the Duke of Sully, p. 64.

Pag. 942.

Ibid.

Ibid. p. 77.

The same Author tells us, that (not three months before the murder), *Those that were tainted with the Treason of the old League, endeavour'd to patch up a new one. And it was said the foundations of it were laid at la Flesche (in the Colledg of the Jesuits) for a woman affirm'd she had seen in an house where they kept many Scholars, certain Registers, which many had subscrib'd with Signatures of blood.* And that the same persons who contriv'd this League, were also the contrivers of the Parricide it self, and did prepare and discipline *Ravillac* for the execution of it, the same Historian does plainly enough inform us, tho he does not mention the name of Jesuits: *Those, says he, that premeditated to rid themselves of the King, finding this Instrument so proper to att their design, knew very well how to confirm him in his sentiments; they had people at their beck who haunted him eternally, tho he knew not their intents; who caused him to be instructed by their DOCTORS, and enchanted him with supposed Visions, and other like Diabolical arts. There are proofs that they carried him as far as Naples, where in an Assembly in the Vice-Roy's Palace, he met with many others, who had all devoted themselves to the same end. In fine, they managed and guided him so well to their purpose, that by his sacrilegious hand they perpetrated the detestable resolutions of their own wicked and accursed hearts.* And then he proceeds to relate the manner how that Tragical act was perform'd, and adds this very remarkable passage. *There were two things then observed from which the Reader may draw what consequence he pleases: The one, that when they had taken the Assassin, seven or eight men were seen to come up with their drawn swords, who cried aloud, he ought to be cut in pieces presently, and then immediately shelter'd themselves in the crowd. The other, that he was not presently put into Goal, but into the hands of Montigny, where they kept him two days in the Hostel de Rous, with so little care, that all sorts of people spake with him; and among others, a Religious person, who had great obligations to the King, having accosted him, and called him, My Friend, said to him, he should have a care of accusing honest people.* Our Author affirms, that this Religious person was Cotton, and his Answerers confess that Cotton made a visit to him: But *Mezeray*, tho 'tis plain he meant him, durst go no further than a hint. *Thuanus* reflecting on the reports disseminated about the King's death, makes this judg-

judgment of it: *That if the many conspiracies against the person of this Prince be well considered, no one can doubt, but this last was forged in the same shop in which the others were framed.* And then he gives a compendious account of several Plots against him, and particularly that of *Chassel*, for which the Society was banish'd. He seems indeed chiefly to aim at *Spain* in this reflection. But 'tis well known that the Jesuits were then always engaged in the *Spanish Plots*, and were the chief workmen in their Forges.

'Tis further observ'd by the same *Tbuanus*, that *Ravillac* had been thoroughly instructed in the Doctrine of killing Kings, tho he was grossly ignorant in all other points of Divinity; and in all his Answers to the Interrogatories of those who were deputed to examin him, he defended himself with the Maxims of *Mariana*, and other Jesuits, that assert the lawfulness of killing Kings, and was well skill'd in all their solutions and distinctions. He freely confest that the reason why he resolv'd to kill the King, was, Because being addicted to the Reformed Religion, he had not reduced the *Hugonots* to the *Romish* Faith; and that he was confirm'd in this resolution, by hearing that the King designed to wage War against the Pope, because this was to fight against God; For the Pope was God. He also voluntarily confest, *That he had insinuated his design to F. Aubigny a Jesuit, shewing him a Knife, on which a Heart and a Cross was engraven, and saying withal, that the heart of the King ought to be mov'd to a War with the Hugonots.* This Confession came freely and readily from him; and when it was read over to him, he persisted in it, and subscribed it. And when afterwards the Jesuit was brought to him, he affirmed the same things to his face before the Commissioners. But *Aubigny* replied, it was all false; and that after so detestable a fact, he ought not to accuse any one falsely, and so aggravate his crime. This was such another hint as *F. Cotton* had given him before; and *Ravillac* immediately took it, and declar'd he had nothing to say against him; that he esteem'd him to be a good and a pious man, and believed what he said to be true.

It is to be observed, that when † *Barriere* was convinced by some Divines of the horrible impiety of murdering Kings, and so was brought to repentance; He confest that those who ex-

Ibid. 78. E. and 85. D.

Ibid. 78. A.

Ibid. 79. D.

Ibid. B.

Ibid. p. 81. E.

† *Tbuan.* lib. 107 p. 385.

cited

cited him to that villany, assur'd him, that if he should perish in the attempt, his soul would be carried by Angels into eternal bliss. But withal caution'd him, That if he should be taken and tortured to confess his Complices, he should not discover them, because he would be certainly damn'd eternally for it. * It is very likely that the DOCTORS who had the tutoring of *Ravillac*, had prepossessed and fortified him with those necessary perswasions; and then (if it be considered that such perswasions have often made Villains suffer with as much resolution as Martyrs) it is no extraordinary thing that this Assassin should with such an invincible obstinacy undergo all the most exquisite tortures that could be invented to force a discovery from him, and persevere to the very last to deny that he had any Complices in his Villany.

Eudæmon to vindicate the Jesuits from the suspicion of this Murder, and to shew that neither the Wife nor Son of *Henry* the 4th thought them Conscions of it, produces an Edict of *Lewis* the 13th made in his minority, by the direction of the Queen Regent; wherein a very favourable Character is given of the Jesuits, and their reestablishment further confirm'd. But this is really no more than their own testimony for themselves: For the Jesuits * were then predominant at Court, and during all this Regency, carried all before them; They had got the keeping of the Queens heart, as well as that of the Murdered King; And knew well enough how to use it to their own advantage. And to this absolute power of the Jesuits, is the condemnation of *Anti-Cotton* urged by *Eudæmon*, p. 44. to be ascrib'd. In that juncture it was not difficult to get that book condemn'd, and it was their interest to suppress an Author that wounded them so deeply. They would have dealt with him as || *Mexeray* says, a certain *Damoiselle*, named *Anne de Comans* was dealt with, who had before the Kings death given notice of a horrible conspiracy against him; and after he was dead, persisted in it; but they pretended she was mad, and shut her up. The Historian thereupon complains, || that the juncture of those times, and the too great importance of the subject have wholly suppress'd many strange things. And 'twas but necessary to suppress them, if that were true which he says many believed, that the Instruments of this execution were in the bosom of France, and even hid in the Royal Family.

* See what is cited by *Foulis* out of *Hurd. de Prefix* to this purpose, p. 642.

* *Thuan. Hist.* Cont. p. 101.

|| Pag. 940.

|| See what *Foulis* cites out of the same *de Prefix* to this purpose, p. 643

The Apologist of the Jesuits urge further the improbability of their attempting any thing against the life of a Prince, that was so great a friend to their Order; and that if they could be supposed so wicked, they could not be imagined so destitute of common prudence, as to destroy their greatest Patron and Benefactor. But to unfold this mystery: 'Tis only necessary to observe these three things. 1. That † the King had formed vast designs against *Spain* and the house of *Austria*; had amassed a vast treasure, and rais'd a great Army to execute them. This struck directly at the interest of the whole Society, which were then inseparably link'd to those of *Spain*, and therefore they were concerned by any means to prevent designs so pernicious to them. † *Mexeray*, p. 916, 935, 940.

2. The Catholics suspected that he was not firm to their Religion. It was well enough known, * that Politick arguments had the greatest share in his conversion, and that the Catholics threatening to desert him, if he would not turn, made him see the absolute necessity of it. And therefore there was reason to suspect the sincerity of it. † *Thuanus* affirms, that after his defection to the Roman Religion, he still retain'd the seeds of that persuasion in which he had been educated. His entering into a League with the Protestant Princes, gave them some umbrage, and a new holy League was thereupon projected by the Jesuits against him. And it is, lastly, certain, that whatever the King's designs were, *Ravillac* was fully perswaded by those that had the management of them, that his aim was to ruin his Holiness, and the Roman Religion, and this was the cause that instigated that Devilish Zealot to destroy him. * *Mexeray*, 829. *Davila*, p. 612. † *Ibid*. p. 95.

3. After his death the Jesuits were so far from being losers by it, that they became Masters of all their designs. Edicts were often published in favour of them. The conditions with which their restitution was clog'd, were rescinded; and it soon appear'd that the University of *Paris* would not be able to maintain their ground against them. And accordingly their long contests with that University were at length ended as themselves would have it. And the State-intrigues too, succeeded as well as they could desire. *Mexeray* tells us, That after the Kings death, the Court wholly changed its face, the Government its Maxims, the Ministers their designs. Pag. 943.

The.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

The Orders which Henry the Great had established, were reversed, his Oeconomy dissipated, his faithful servants turn'd out of doors, and his Alliances forsaken to take up new ones; so that France, which was so lately triumphant, saw her self reduc'd under the Government and direction of Spain, and the Agents of the Court of Rome, who were the Oracle of the Regency. So that 'tis evident the Interests of Rome and Spain, and the whole Society, thriv'd by the King's death, no less than those of the Order in France. And that Butchery of him, as it was agreeable to their Principles, so it was very serviceable to their Designs.

Thus far have I endeavoured to justify the truth of the most important passages related by *Anti-Cotton*; and now I shall consider briefly those in which *F. Cotton* himself, who gave occasion to this Treatise by his Declaratory Letter, was peculiarly concern'd.

Anti-Cotton p. 38. recites the Story of *F. Cotton's* consulting a Demoniac about the life of the King, and several other affairs. *Thuanus* gives a much larger account of this passage, and agrees exactly with our Author in it. His Apologists endeavour to excuse him, by saying that he only put some odd questions to the Dam'fel to discover whether she was really possessed. But what occasion was there then to enquire about the King's life? Was this a proper Interrogatory to find out a Devil by? Or was it only to trapan the evil spirit into a discovery of himself, that he asked such questions as these, *Which was the best Text of Scripture to prove Purgatory, and the Invocation of Saints? What God would permit the spirit to reveal to him about Confession, Vows, Cases of Conscience, and the conversion of Souls? What advantage might be had from the conversion of the King? What Hereticks were most likely to be converted? When the Heresie of Calvin should be extinguished? Why Geneva was so often preserved? And what Plots the Devils were hatching against the Jesuits?* This consulting the Devil as an Oracle, is, I think, worse than *Luther's* pretended disputing with him. But a Jesuit must be allow'd to puzzle and confound the Devil: And I believe a more impossible task was never put upon him, than to prove Purgatory, and Saint-Worship by Scripture.

Anti-

By *Anti-Cotton* we have an account of a Conspiracy discover'd by *Monsieur de la Forze*, and stifled by *F. Cotton*. *Thuanus* Hist. Con. tells us only that *de la Forze* discover'd some design against the King three years before he was assassin'd. But he gives no account of the particulars. And 'tis probable *Father Cotton's* being concern'd in it, was the reason of his silence. P. 77. B.

He charges *Cotton* with discovering the Kings secrets to the *Spanish* Provincial. This correspondency with *Spain* was then the subject of a *Pasquin* upon him. And *Foulis* says, that the Duke of *Sully* prov'd to the King that in that he was guilty, as himself affirms in his *Memoirs*. P. 644.

He reflects on *Cotton* for being a Courtier, a thing contrary, not only to the Institution of Monks, but particularly to the Rules of the *Jesuits*. To this the *Apologist* replies, That the *Jesuits* are not Monks, and therefore not obliged to the retirements of such; that their Rules bind them to live any where for the good of their Neighbour; and that they frequent Princes Courts to preserve them from Heresie. But 'tis evident *F. Cotton's* business at Court was not merely to take care of the King's Religion. He was not only his Confessor, but also one of his chiefest States-men; and therefore this can be no Apology for him. But it seems there is no other way to secure Religion at Court, but by posting *Jesuits* there; and they are the fittest men to preserve Kings from Heresie, who know what to do with them when they are inclining to it, that is, to poyson or stab them.

The II Constitutions of the *Jesuits* do expressly forbid them to meddle with Secular Affairs, or to suffer themselves to be busied in them. And Anno 1593 *, there was a Decree made by a General Congregation at *Rome*, That no *Jesuit* should busie himself in the State-affairs of Princes: And that he should not presume or dare to undertake the management of such

* *Hospin. Hist. Jesuitica.* p. 89. præcipitur omnibus in virtute sanctæ obedi-

entia, ne quispiam publicis & sæcularium principum negotiis ullâ ratione se immiscere, nec etiam quantumvis per quoscunque requisitus aut rogatus ejusmodi res tractandi curam suscipere audeat vel præsumat; idque seriò commendatur superioribus, ne permittant Sociis iis rebus ullo modo implicari; & si quos ad ea propensos animadvertent eos loco murandos, quamprimum commutent, si alicubi occasio vel periculum sit se ejusmodi implicationibus irretiendi.

matters, though never so much prest and importuned to it; and Superiors are advised that if they observe any one forward to entangle himself in such matters, to remove him to a place where he may have no opportunity or temptation to it.

How well the Jesuits have observed these Constitutions, the whole world can witness. And whether they were at all intended to oblige, themselves can tell us. But the glory of God, and the good of their Neighbour are, they say, the principal ends of their Society; and for the promoting of these, all their Subordinate Rules may be dispensed with. And hence it is, that they who vow the strictest poverty, can yet become the Proprietors of all things, and have a greater revenue than ever Kings and Emperors. Hence they can be made Archbishops and Cardinals for the good of the Church; though by a special Vow they are excluded all Dignities and Benefices in it; and so though they are forbidden to be concerned in Secular Affairs, yet for the good of their Neighbour they can become Merchants, Bankers, and Monopolizers; and for the good of Kingdoms become Counsellors and Ministers of State, though they are peremptorily forbidden to intermeddle in State-Affairs.

P. 54.

† Hist. Cont.

P. 95.

* Pag. 908.

He reproaches Cotton for conniving at the King's pleasures; nay encouraging and assisting him in the pursuit of them, and for some private Amorous intrigues of his own. As for his conniving at the King's Amours, 'tis plain the Portuguese Father mention'd by Anti-Cotton, did publickly tax him for it; as may be seen in that part of his Discourse which † Thuanus has inserted in his Characters of Henry the Fourth, to shew that the King's Favourites did sooth and flatter him in his Vices. And * Mezeray does covertly insinuate the same reflection: When, says he, Father Cotton was made Confessor to the King, all good men did rejoice, imagining he could shew no connivance for the King's Amours, but that he would make use of the power of his Ministry, which certainly was most necessary, to cure him of an infirmity that was become habitual. The Historian adds, that he wanted no qualities to make him successful in his Sphere: But his circumspection, his complaisance and dexterity to lay hold of time and opportunity wer

were employed to insinuate himself into the King's favour, and oft times into his very bosom, and most retir'd thoughts.

To the passages of Cotton's own private Amours, the *Apologist* produces several Certificates from *Avignon* and *Nismes* to contradict them; and to give Testimonies of his great Holiness and Piety. It may be our Author as to these particulars was wrong informed concerning the Father; but what credit is to be given to such Certificates, I leave every one to judg. It was not difficult for the Jesuits, who were then so powerful, to procure what Certificates they pleased. And the great commendations they give of his Piety (of which his consulting the Devil is an irrefragable Testimony) may make one suspect the truth of all they affirm. But the *Apologist* himself does furnish me with an answer to them; for he rejects the appeal of *Anti-Cotton* to *Monsieur des Bordes*, because he was a Protestant; and we have the same right to reject his Testimonials, because subscribed by Jesuited Catholics.

It remains now only to add something concerning that which was the chief design of the Author of this Paper; namely, To represent the Jesuits as a Society whose Principles and Practises tended to the subversion of the publick Peace, and the overthrow of all the Foundations of Government. This he has made good by appealing to the Books of their approved Authors, the Rebellions and Assassinations they fomented in *France*, their Plots and Conspiracies against *England*, and the great Com-motions they had raised in *Poland*, *Transylvania*, and *Venice*; he might have added *Portugal*, *Hungary*, and the Empire of *Germany* also.

And this Charge, as odious as it is, may be abundantly verified out of the Historians, and other Writers of their own Religion.

In short, there is nothing more certain in History, than that this Society, ever since the Institution of it, have been hurtful to Kings and Provinces, have raised Insurrection and Sedition, and turn'd the world upside down.

A Vindication of Anti-Cotton,

And there is no reason to imagine that the present Members of it are better than their Fore-fathers, or that they will not still walk on in the beaten Paths of their Predecessors. As for us Protestants, the Jesuits have always esteem'd it their greatest Glory, that they have been our greatest and most implacable Enemies; and that they have done more Service to the Catholick Cause against us, than all the other Orders and Ecclesiasticks of their Church.

* *Alphonfus de Vargas, c. 8. p. 20. Germ. Jesuitæ in justâ defensione sui: Monarchos irident qui Apostolos imitati Verbi prædicatione & vitæ Sanctimonîâ Hæreticos ad Ecclesiæ Communionem reducere conantur. Istius enim modi non nisi inter Ethnicos usum esse aliquem; Hæreticos verò Edictis, minis, atque etiam poenis compelli oportere; hic optimus est Hæreticos convertendi modus.*

* A Spanish Writer informs us, That the German Jesuits, in a Printed Apology, deride and scoff at those that in imitation of the Apostles endeavour to convert Hereticks, by preaching of the Word unto them; affirming, That there was some use indeed of preaching in converting Pagans; but that Hereticks ought to be compell'd by Edicts, Threats

and Punishments; and that this was the best way of converting Hereticks. These are the Methods which the Jesuits have always reli'd on, as the most efficacious means of reducing us to their Religion; and have never failed, when opportunity served to put them in Practice. And so outrageous has their Malice been, that some of them have plainly assur'd us, that we are never to expect any Quarter from them; and that, however to promote the Catholick Cause, they may vouchsafe to Treat and Capitulate with us; yet, when such Capitulations become prejudicial to it, then they must without scruple be broken, and Faith must not be kept with Hereticks against the Church. *Becanus* has honestly told us, That all Laws and Compacts which give Liberty to every Man to be Catholick, Lutheran or Calvinist, are in themselves unlawful, and repugnant to the Divine Will, and are not but for some time

Apud. Hospin. ex Disp. de fi. de hæreticis servanda, l. 10. p. 87 &

sequ. Afferit libertatem sive pactionem illam religionis, quâ liberum permittitur esse, Catholicum vel Lutheranum, vel Calvinistam; omnino esse illicitam & Divino præcepto repugnantem, nec aliter quam aliquo tempore majoris damni vitandi causa, tolerari posse. P. 94. Imo hæc liberas à Catholicis omnibus modis quantum commode fieri potest, impediri & profligari debet. Nullus sit istis Ministeriorum locus: Sciant omnes, etiamsi quid speciali rescripto vel pacto ab hujusmodi hominum genere impetratum sit, non valere.

against the Cavils of his Answerers.

to be tolerated to avoid a greater Evil; nay, such a Liberty must by all means be hindered and destroyed by Catholics. Let the Hereticks, adds he, have no License to exercise their Religion; and let all Men know, that if any such License be granted by special Pacts and Edicts, it is not valid. There may be other Jesuits produced, that have taught the same Doctrine, tho it may be not so plainly. And 'tis evident, that they who believe that Subjects may be absolv'd from their Fidelity to Heretical Princes (which is the known Doctrine of the Jesuits) must reciprocally believe that Princes may be likewise absolved from all Obligations of Fidelity to Heretical Subjects. But tho they have not always openly owned this Doctrine, yet 'tis certain they have always practic'd it: And Protestants have been always convinc'd by sad Experience, that where-ever this Society has been Predominant, their Pacifications, Edicts, Compacts, and the most solemn Promises and Engagements have proved no better than Cobwebs to shelter and protect them; and have only served as Duckoys, to draw them into their Nets, and trapan them into Destruction. But Treachery foreseen, is half prevented; and open War is not near so dangerous as an insidious Peace. F. Campian has long since in the name of all his Order, publicly proclaim'd irreconcilable War against us: Know, says he, that as for our Society, all of us, who are dispersed far and wide throughout the World, of whom there is a perpetual Succession, and an infinite number have entred into a Holy League; and as long as any one of us remain, will never break off our Endeavours and Designs about your Salvation (for that was his Cant for extirpating the pestilent Northern Heresy) the method of accomplishing it, is long since resolved on, and the Battel begun, and no Force, no Efforts of the English shall overcome us. This was a brave and gallant Enemy; and tho he himself ingloriously perish'd in this War at Tyburn; yet this did not discourage the rest of his Society, from carrying it on with

Camp. in concertatione Ec. Cath. Treviris excusa apud Hospin. p. 22. Anno 1533. Quod ad Societatem nostram attinet, omnes qui per totum orbem longe lateque diffusi sumus, quorum est continua successio, & magnus numerus, Sanctum foedus inisse, nec quamdiu vel unus nostrum supererit, studium & consilia nostra de salute vestra intermissuros; jam pridem inita ratio est & inchoatum certamen, nulla vis, nullus Anglorum impetus superabit.

A Kindication of Anti-Cotton

with invincible Obstinacy, in spite of all those many Defeats which Providence has given them; and so they have brought it down to this Generation, to be convey'd to those that come after us, till the Providence of God (whose Counsels are unsearchable) shall destroy the Kingdom of Sin, and restore Peace to *Jerusalem*. And blessed be the ever-ruling Providence of God, who hath so often delivered this Church from the greatest dangers, and doth deliver it now, we trust that he will yet deliver us.

F I N I S.

